



This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

- + *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.
- + *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.
- + *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.
- + *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at <http://books.google.com/>





600085084V



ENGLISH GRAMMAR.

LONDON: PRINTED BY
SPOTTISWOODE AND CO., NEW-STREET SQUARE
AND PARLIAMENT STREET

AN ELEMENTARY
ENGLISH GRAMMAR

FOR THE USE OF SCHOOLS.

By R. G. LATHAM, M.A., M.D., &c.

LATE FELLOW OF KING'S COLLEGE, CAMBRIDGE:

LATE PROFESSOR OF ENGLISH IN UNIVERSITY COLLEGE, LONDON.

NEW EDITION,

THOROUGHLY REVISED AND GREATLY ENLARGED.

LONDON:
LONGMANS, GREEN, AND CO.

1875.

302. g. 193

All rights reserved.

PREFACE.

BETWEEN the end of the third and the middle of the sixth century a language different from both the original British and the Latin of the Roman period was introduced into England. It was the mother tongue of the present English. We know the direction in which it spread; because in Wales and Scotland the original Celtic still keeps its ground. And we know that about A.D. 600 it was firmly established in the Eastern half of South Britain as the *English*. Two names of two divisions of the German family, *Angle* and *Saxon*, are also known to us. But the date of its first introduction, the rate at which it encroached upon the earlier forms of speech, along with the exact way in which it has extended itself, are points about which we know very little.

This is, doubtless, a matter of regret. On the other hand, however, if we look upon the study of the English Language purely and simply as grammarians, we can dispense with the study of its external history; or, at least, the two branches of investigation can be kept separate. As to the essentially foreign and German character of the English, the language speaks for itself. We know it familiarly as it is spoken at the present moment. We have specimens of it as old as the eighth century, and we have a rich intermediate literature. Moreover we have the present German,

and allied languages of Holland, of Denmark, of Norway, of Sweden, and of Iceland, with which we can compare it. Hence, even when loaded with additions from the Latin, the French, the Greek, and other languages, its genuine German character is undoubted.

I am not prepared to say that with this we may not be satisfied. In this case we may begin at once with the details of our language and its affinities to the German dialects of the Continent. The presumptions deduced from the little that we know of its external history may coincide with its known structure; or they may differ from it. They may lead us to suppose that our language should be as free from British or Latin elements as it actually is. Or they may lead us to expect more remains of the languages which it displaced than we find. But upon these questions we may abstain from speculation. In other words we may take our language with its German character as we find it, and pronounce it to be what it is, either with the presumptions in favour of its being so, or in spite of them.

Much may be said in favour of this mode of treatment. It is usual, however, to say something about its introduction; about the parts of Germany from which it came; about the import of the terms Angle and Saxon; about the relations of the dialects of Germany Proper and Scandinavia; and, above all, about the extent to which the blood and the language of the English nation coincide.

All this—as has just been stated—may be avoided by limiting our consideration to the language itself. Nevertheless, one thing is certain: viz., that if the question of its introduction is to be gone into, it must be gone into thoroughly. If we write about it at all, we must write fully.

In a work like the present this is impossible. But the present is only the forerunner to a larger one; in which the subject is treated more comprehensively. Still there are special pieces of evidence with which the reader cannot make himself familiar too soon, and on this principle the chief notices in the way of evidence are laid before him. Even when taken altogether they are neither numerous nor long. The selected texts in the present small volume may be counted on our fingers. They fall, however, into two classes—the first containing the incidental allusions of the *cotemporary* Latin and Greek writers; the second the account of the Venerable Beda in the eighth century. Each class has its merits, and each its weak points. But if we give one, we must give the other also: for it is certain that they do not coincide. Of this the reader should be aware; though it is not necessary that on the very threshold of his studies he should either fix upon the class he prefers, or trouble himself to reconcile the two. But—as said before—he should know from the very first the nature of the scanty materials he has to deal with.

The Saxons came from Southern, the Angles from Northern, Germany; the former introducing the dialect in which the chief works of the times anterior to the Norman Conquest are composed. The latter brought with them the dialects of the parts between the Humber and the Forth; and these culminated in the literary languages of Scotland under the first five Stuarts. The former is represented by the present dialects of Dorsetshire, Devonshire, and the West of England, and is called Westsaxon; the latter by the Lowland Scotch and the English between the Tweed and the Humber. This is called Northumbrian. Out of the intermediate dialects arose the present literary English. These, though all three *dialects* of the German

of England, have as fair a claim to be called different *languages* as the Danish and Swedish, or the Spanish and Portuguese; and each has its several stages.

But besides this there are stages of the English language in general; and it is necessary to separate the two histories.

In Part II., which treats of *Orthoëpy* and *Orthography*, there is little which is not found in the earlier editions.

And the same may be said of Part V., which treats of *Prosody*.

In the Third and Fourth Parts, which give us *Etymology* and *Syntax*, the general principle which distinguishes them from one another is clear and precise. Where we have words like *father* and *fathers*—*write* and *wrote*—*call* and *called*—we have, in each pair, *one* word and no more. This is *Etymology*. The second word is a slightly altered form of the first. Still it is a *single* word.

In combinations like—*of a father*—*I have written*—*I am calling*, and the like, we have *more words than one*. This is *Syntax*; i. e. two, three, or (it may be more) words in combination. Sometimes one of these governs the other. Sometimes they are in concord or agreement. But, in all cases, they are two words in combination. Hence the name *Syntax*.

On the first view nothing is clearer, or more distinctive, than this. There are, doubtless, cases where the place of a word is equivocal; e. g. in compounds. Terms like *oak-tree*, *Thursday*, and hundreds of others are of this class; and it cannot be denied that they may belong to *either Syntax or Etymology*. They belong to *Syntax* so far as they are *two* words. But they are combined together and treated as one: and, so far, may be referred to *Etymology*. Still the class of compounds is not the one that need

detain us longer. It raises a slight objection to the principle here laid down; but not one of much practical importance. When we say *all bláck birds are not bláckbirds*, it is easy to see that in the first pair, we have two *separate* words; in the second, two words compounded into one.

The class which has a tendency to perplex us is represented by such combinations as *the hand of a man* when compared with *a man's hand*, *the skin of the lion*, &c. &c. Here the words *man's* and *lion's* are, according to every test, Genitive Cases, and, as such, single words belonging to Etymology; whereas *hat of a man* and *skin of the lion* are combinations of words, and, as such, belong to Syntax. In sense, however, they are so nearly identical that we are tempted to treat them as such. At any rate, we say that *of* is the sign of Genitive case. Yet *lion* is not a Genitive case at all. The true fact is somewhat different; and the accurate expression is—not that *lion* is a Genitive Case of which *of* is sign—but that there is a combination of a wholly different character with a meaning equivalent to a Genitive Case.

In the Verb the tendency to confusion is greater, and the influence of the Latin Grammar has much to do with it—that of the Greek a little. But the Latin is sufficient for our illustration. Where the Latin gives us *scribam* = *I shall write*; *scribebam* = *I was writing*; *scripsi* = *I have written*, and the like, it gives us a true Future, a true Imperfect, and a true Past Tense; and, as such, a form in Etymology. The English equivalents in sense, which are all combinations of different words, in every sense, belong to Syntax.

In the Passives we get a still more decisive influence. *Amor* = *I am loved*, *amabar* = *I was loved*, *amabor* = *I shall be loved*; all of which are Etymological Tenses. But

in the same table *amatus sum* = *I am loved*, is treated exactly in the same way. It is called the Perfect Passive Tense : whereas it is really a combination of the Substantive Verb with the Past Passive Participle. The difference in the way of form and expression is clear ; but the meaning is that of a true Tense.

It is not, then, strange that combinations so accurately coinciding in sense as *I shall write* and *scribam* should be placed in the same class, and treated as *Tenses*.

This, perhaps, is enough to illustrate the difference between true Inflections like *fathers*, *wrote*, *patris*, *scripsi*, and the like, and combinations like of (a) *father*, *have written*, *shall write*, *was writing*, &c. There is a true Case or Tense in one series ; a combination of different words as its substitute in the other.

It is only necessary to add that I have carefully kept these two classes distinct ; referring the first to Etymology, the second to Syntax ; I have done this not merely here and there, but generally and thoroughly ; and I believe that no competent critic will deny the propriety of my doing so, as a matter of pure and simple Grammar ; or that he will condemn the distinction as wrong in itself. Some, perhaps most, of them recognise it partially ; and, perhaps, I may suggest that they would go further in the same direction, if the practice to the contrary were less prevalent than it is. Sooner or later, however, the thoroughgoing character of the distinction must prevail, and, in my mind, the period of transition and compromise is coming to a close.

This difference between true Inflections like the signs of Case and Tense in words like *patris*, *fathers*, *scribam*, *scripsi*, &c., as opposed to combinations like of (a) *father*, *will write*, &c., concerning which thus much has already been said, has another bearing upon our grammar. We have

seen that for the former the latter may be substituted. But are we sure that this is an accurate way of speaking? It is certainly accurate when we translate from Latin into English; for then we render an original single word like *scripsi* by the combination *have written*. But what if we translate *I have written* into *scripsi*? In such a case the combination is the original form, and the Inflection the substitute. This, however, is a point upon which we need not dwell. What we must most especially understand is that, so far as meaning goes, certain inflections have certain combinations by which they may be represented, and *vice versâ*.

For these two modes of representation there are two names. Forms like *scripsi*, *scribam*, *scribebam*, *scripturus*, &c., where we have but one word, are called *Synthetic*. Their substitutes, such as *I have written* or *I wrote*, *I shall write*, *I was writing*, *I am about to write*, &c. are called *Analytic*. Languages in which the single word prevails are called *Synthetic*; those in which the combination of more words than one prevails are called *Analytic*. But this is not all. The same language which is *Synthetic* in one stage may become *Analytic* in another; the Latin for instance is *Synthetic*, its daughter (the Italian) *Analytic*. More still—the change is, as a rule, in one direction. The *Synthetic* stage is always the older of the two; *i. e.* *Synthetic* languages become *Analytic* as they become modern. The converse never takes place. In the *Synthetic* languages the signs of Case, Tense, Mood, Person, Voice, and the like are numerous, and well marked; so that if we see a word with its signs of Case and Gender, we know that it is a Noun, even if it stands alone. And if we see it with the marks of Person, or Tense, we infer that it is a Verb. When this is the case it is easy to say what it is as a Part

of Speech. But when all these outward and visible signs are gone, we have no such criterion.

Now the English is the most Analytic Language in the world. It has so few inflections of any kind that there are few words in it which we can distinguish from one another as Parts of Speech, except by observing what place they take in the construction of a sentence ; and we can only do this by applying the rules of Syntax. Hence, it is in the Syntax rather than in the Etymology that the differences between the several Parts of Speech—Noun, Pronoun, Verb, &c.—are explained.

Nearly all this, however, is already exhibited in my earlier Editions, and, to some extent, recognised. In other matters the alterations are limited to particular details.

CONTENTS.



PART I.—HISTORICAL INTRODUCTION.

SECTION	PAGE
1-2. The English Language of Foreign Origin	1
3. The names under which it extended itself	1
4. Early notices of the Angles. Tacitus.	2
5-6. Ptolemy	2
7. Languages with which the English came into contact	3
8. The Latin; was this Vernacular?	3
9. Rate and Date of the Introduction and Diffusion of the English Language	4
10. Evidence	4
11. The Franks of Mamertinus*	4
12. The first notice of the Saxons in Gaul	5
13. The Saxons in connection with Britain	6
14. The Saxons of Carausius	6
15. Three Periods in the History of the word Saxon	7
16. Importance of the Second	8
17. The Subjection of Britain under the Saxons	9
18. The Evacuation of Britain by the Romans	10
19. The Letter to Ætius	10
20. The Frisians of Procopius	11
21. The Mission of St. Augustin	12
22. The Authority of Beda	13
23. His Evidence for the Sixth and Fifth Centuries	15
24. His Notice of Jutes, Saxons, and Angles	15
25. The <i>Angulus</i> of Beda	16
26. The Danes or Northmen in Britain	16
27. The Fragment of Ceadmon, and Death-bed Verses of Beda	19
28, 29, 30. The Northumbrian Dialect of the English	20-21
31. The Westsaxon Dialect	22

* See under ERRATUM, p. xx.

SECTION	PAGE
32-33. The Midland or Mercian Dialect	23-24
35, 36. The Stages of the English Language	24-26
37. Semi-Saxon	26
38-39. Old English	26-27
40. Middle English	27
41-49. Remarks	27-29
46. <i>Anglo-Saxon</i> as opposed to <i>Old English</i>	29
47. <i>Semi-Saxon</i>	31
48-49. The <i>English</i> as a member of the <i>German</i> family	32-33
50. Norse, or Scandinavian Characteristics	33
51-52. The <i>Moesogothic</i>	33-35
53. The Indo-European, &c., Class of Languages	36
54. The Slavonic	36
55. The Lithuanic	37
56. The Latin	38
57. The Greek	38
58. The Sanskrit	38
59. The original British	39

PART II.—ORTHOËPY AND ORTHOGRAPHY.

60. Speaking and Spelling	41
61. The Elementary Sounds of the English Language	42-45
64. Surd and Sonant Sounds	46-48
65. Concurrence of Identical Sounds	48
66. The Alphabet	48
67. Its Insufficiency	49
68. Recapitulation	50
69-72. Accent	51-52

PART III.—ETYMOLOGY.

73. Etymology of Two Kinds	53
74. Composition	53
75. Derivation	54
76. Inflection	54
77. Transitional Forms	55
78. Composition	56
79. Adverbs in Composition	57
80. Derivation	57
81. Words in <i>-ry</i>	59
82. Words in <i>-ster</i>	60
83. Inflection; <i>Gender</i>	60
84. Number	62

CONTENTS.

XV

SECTION	PAGE
85-86. Case	62-64
87. Inflection of Pronouns	64
88-89. Demonstratives and Interrogatives	65-68
90. The true Personal Pronouns	68
91. <i>One</i> and <i>Man</i>	70
92. The <i>s-</i> in <i>this</i> , <i>these</i> , and <i>those</i>	70
93-96. The Numerals	70-72
97. Possessive and Objective as names of English Cases	72
98. The Objective Case	73
99. Virtual Inflections	73
100. Substantives	73
101. The Possessive Plural	74
102. Plurals in <i>-s</i>	75
103. Plurals of certain words in <i>-f</i>	75
104. Plurals in <i>-ce</i>	76
105. Equivocal forms of Singulars in <i>-s</i>	77
106. Plurals not ending in <i>-s</i>	79
107. Change of Vowel	79
108. Addition of <i>-en</i> or <i>-n</i>	79
109. <i>Childer</i>	80
110. <i>Kyne</i> , <i>Children</i> , <i>Brethren</i>	80
111. Plurals of words ending in <i>-o</i> , <i>-y</i> , &c.	80
112. Current and Obsolete Processes	80
113-114. The Possessive Case	81-82
115. Adjectives	82
116. Degrees of Adjectives	82
117-120. The Comparative Degree	83-85
121-124. The Superlative Degree	85-87
125. Verbals	87
126-128. Verbs	88-89
129. Number	89
130. Person	90
131. Tense	90
132. Mood	90
133. Signs of Number	92
134. Signs of Mood	92
135-139. Signs of Person	93-94
140-143. Forms in <i>-ing</i>	95-96
144. Finite Verbs	96
Extract from Garnett	97
145. Tense	98
146. The Past Tenses in English	99
147-150. Reduplication of the Perfect	100-103
151. Perfects like <i>spoke</i> , &c., not Irregular	103

SECTION	PAGE
152. 'Strong' and 'Weak' as terms	104
153. The Perfect Tense	105
154. Its Vowel <i>Long</i> as in <i>blow, blew</i>	106
155. Its Vowel <i>Short</i> as in <i>swim, swum</i>	109
156-159. Reduplication retained— <i>did, hight</i>	110-112
160. Irregularity and Defect	112
161. Classification	112
162. The Preterit Tense	113
163. The Connecting Vowel	114
164. The final letter of Syllable	114
165. Verbs in <i>-d</i> and <i>-t</i>	115
166. Euphonic rule	116
167. <i>Deal, Dealt, &c.</i>	117
168. <i>Bereave, bereft, &c.</i>	117
169. <i>Tell, told sell, sold</i>	117
170-171. Verbs in which the final Consonant is <i>k</i> or <i>g</i>	118
172. Voice in connection with Participles	119
173. Parts of Speech ending in <i>-ing</i>	120
174. What are they?	122
175-176. The Passive Participles in <i>-en</i>	124
177. <i>Clad</i>	126
178. <i>Sodden</i>	126
179-180. Present Perfects	127-128
181. <i>Auxiliary Verbs</i> ; The root in <i>-s</i>	128
182. <i>Was</i>	130
183. <i>Be</i>	132
184. Defective Verbs	133
185. Confluent Forms	134
186. Comparison of Adverbs	136
187. Adverbs originating in Cases	136
188. Forms in <i>-ing</i>	137
189. <i>Toward, towards, &c.</i>	138

PART IV.—SYNTAX.

190-192. Syntax as opposed to Etymology	139
193. Propositions	140
194-197. Terms and Copulas	141-142
198. Many-worded Terms	142
199. Declaratory Propositions	143
200. Interrogative Propositions	143
201. Imperative Propositions	143
202. Propositions in Logic and in Grammar	144
202. Propositions in Logic	144

CONTENTS.

xvii

SECTION	PAGE
203-205. Propositions in Logic of Three Kinds	145
206-207. Subjects and Predicates	147
208. Simplest Form of Proposition	147
209-210. <i>Copula and Terms</i>	147-148
211. <i>Names and Nouns</i>	148
212. <i>Names</i>	149
213-214. <i>Individual or Proper Names</i>	150
215. <i>Common Names</i>	150
216. <i>Proper Names have no Plural, how far is this the case?</i>	151
217. <i>Substance and Attribute; Abstract and Concrete</i>	152
218. <i>Variable and Invariable Names</i>	155
219. <i>Relational and Notional Names</i>	155
220. <i>Parts of Speech</i>	157
221. <i>Details</i>	158
222. <i>The Concord</i>	159
223. <i>Apposition</i>	160
224. <i>Government</i>	161
225. <i>Caution</i>	162
226. <i>Collocation</i>	163
227-228. <i>Disturbing Influences</i>	163
229. <i>Ellipsis</i>	164
230. <i>Pleonasm</i>	164
231. <i>Personification</i>	164
232. <i>Violations, real or apparent, &c.</i>	164
233. <i>Special Details</i>	165
234-235. <i>Simple Propositions; Articles</i>	166-167
236. <i>The Secretary and Treasurer</i>	167
237. <i>An adder, a newt</i>	167
238. <i>The Numerals</i>	168
239. <i>The Thousandth-and-first</i>	168
240. <i>First two and two first</i>	168
241. <i>Pronouns</i>	168
242. <i>You and Ye</i>	169
243. <i>Pronomen reverentia</i>	169
244. <i>Dativus Ethicus</i>	170
245. <i>Reflected Personal Pronouns</i>	170
246. <i>Reflective Neuters</i>	170
247. <i>Equivocal Reflectives</i>	171
248. <i>Indeterminate Constructions</i>	171
249. <i>You, ye—thou</i>	172
250. <i>My, thy—mine, thine, &c.</i>	172
251. <i>This is a discovery of Sir Isaac Newton's</i>	173
252. <i>This book of mine</i>	173

SECTION	PAGE
253. <i>Self</i> in composition	173
254. <i>One says—man sagt</i>	174
255. <i>Substantives</i>	174
256. Government of Substantives	175
257. <i>A man's hat and hat of a man</i>	175
258. Case Absolute	175
259. <i>Adjectives</i>	176
260. Verbs	178
261. Persons	178
262. Government of Verbs	179
263. Syntax of the Participle	180
264-265. <i>I have written, &c.</i>	181
266. <i>I am moved, &c.</i>	182
267. Adverbs	183
268-269. <i>Bright, brightly, &c.</i>	185
270-272. Prepositions	186-187
273. Syntax of Complex Sentences	187
274-279. Relatives and Antecedents	188-191
280. Syntax of Conjunctions	191
281. Copulatives, Disjunctives, Subdisjunctives	192
282. <i>Or</i> and <i>either—nor</i> and <i>neither</i>	192
283. <i>Whether</i>	192
284. <i>Either, neither</i>	193
285. Causal, Illative, &c., Conjunctions	193
286. Copulative, Disjunctive, &c.	193
Concord of Persons	194
287-291. The Conjunctions <i>if, as, than, but</i>	194-196
292. <i>Yes</i> and <i>No</i>	196
293. Negatives	196
294. <i>What is this?</i>	197
295. Reciprocal Construction	197

PART V.—PROSODY.

296. Prosody	199
297. Measures	200
298. Length of Lines	200
299. Rhyme	200
300. Analysis of Rhyming Syllables	201
301. Varieties of Imperfect Rhymes	202-203
302. Accent	203
303. English Measures	203
304. Last Measure of Variable Length	203
305. Dissyllabic Measures	204

CONTENTS.

xix

SECTION	PAGE
306. Heroics	205
<i>Blank Verse</i>	206
Dramatic	206
Narrative	206
307. Trisyllabic Measures	207
308. Couplets, Triplets, Stanzas, &c.	208
Rhyme Royal, &c.	210
Alexandrines, &c.	211
Service Metre	212
Ballad Metre	213
Poulterer's Metre	213
309. Symmetrical and Unsymmetrical Metres	213
310. Convertible Metres	214
311. Metrical and Grammatical Combinations	215
312. <i>English Metres and Classical</i>	216
313. <i>Alliteration of the A.S. and other metres</i>	217
314. Specimens—Anglo-Saxon from Beowulf	218
315. Middle English from Langland	218
316. Old Saxon from the Heliand	219
317. Old High German from Muspilli	220
318. From the Weissenbrun Hymn	221
319. Old Norse—The Edda	221
320. Modern Icelandic—Translation of 'Paradise Lost'	222
321. Modern Swedish, from Tegnér	223

Erratum.

Page 4, § 11, for 'Mamertinus' read 'Eumenius.'

AN

ELEMENTARY ENGLISH GRAMMAR

FOR THE USE OF SCHOOLS.

PART I.

HISTORICAL INTRODUCTION.

CHAPTER I.

§ 1. THE English Language was originally foreign to the British Islands; and *Germany* was the country from which it was introduced.

§ 2. It spread gradually; indeed, at the present moment, there are remains of the original languages in Wales, in Scotland, in the Isle of Man, and in Ireland. There was a similar fragment in Cornwall during the last century.

The English language, then, extended itself over the British Islands more than thirteen hundred years ago, just as it extended itself over North America in the Seventeenth, and over Australia, Tasmania, New Zealand, and the Cape in the present, century.

§ 3. *The names under which it extended itself.*—The two most conspicuous names in the German invasions were those of the *Angles* and the *Saxons*. From the former we get the words *England* and *English*, from the latter the syllable *-sex* in *Essex*, *Middlesex*, *Sussex*, and *Wessex*=*East*, *Middle*, *South*, and *West Saxons*.

The notices of these two names fall into two classes. The first contains those authors that speak about them simply and exclusively, as applying to certain parts of Germany; and without any reference to Britain. The second contains those that connect them with the soil of Britain.

§ 4. *Early notices of the Angles.*—Of these there are two, and two only.

Tacitus.

After mentioning the Langobardi, or Lombards, Tacitus writes thus :—

Then come the Reudigni, the Aviones, the *Angli*, the Varini, the Eudoses, the Suardones, and the Niuthones, protected by either rivers or forests. There is nothing remarkable in detail, for these nations; though, in common, they worship Herth, *i.e.* Earth the Mother.

Reudigni deinde, et Aviones, et *Angli*, et Varini, et Eudoses, et Suardones, et Niuthones, fluminibus aut sylvis muniuntur; nec quidquam notabile in singulis, nisi in commune Herthum, id est Terram Matrem colunt, &c.—*Germania*, § XL.

Ptolemy.

Of the nations of the interior, the greatest are those of the Suevi *Angli* (who be east of the Langobardi, stretching northwards to the middle course of the river Elbe), and of the Suevi Semnones, who reach from the aforesaid part of the Elbe, eastward to the river Suebus, and that of the Buguntæ in continuation as far as the Vistula.—*Lib.* II. c. XL.

§ 5. *Early notices of the Saxons.*—Of these there is only one, that of Ptolemy; for Tacitus says nothing whatever about them.

The Frisians occupy the sea-coast beyond the Busacteri as far as the river Ems. After these the Lesser Chauci, as far as the river Weser; then the Greater Chauci, as far as the Elbe; then in order on the Neck of the Cimbric Chersonese, the *Saxons*; then the Sabalingii, &c.; and after the Saxons, from the river Chalasus to the Suebus, the Pharodini.—*Lib.* II. c. XL.

In another part of the work there is a notice of ‘*Three Islands of the Saxons*,’ but without comment or explanation.

§ 6. Both Tacitus and Ptolemy wrote *after* the reduc-

tion of Britain as a Roman Province; but *before* the time when the Germans became formidable to Rome, and attracted notice as enemies on the coasts both of Gaul and Britain. The interval between the Saxons of Ptolemy and the Saxons of the next writer who will mention them is nearly two hundred years; and with the Angles it is still longer. For this reason, I pause at the two earlier notices. The division is natural; for the populations of Tacitus and Ptolemy had nothing to do with Britain; and there is a considerable interval between the two classes of authorities. For the greater part of the second and third centuries the history of both the Angles and the Saxons is a blank; and when they re-appear, they are more connected with Gaul and Britain than with Germany.

§ 7. *Languages with which the English came into contact.* The original language of *South* Britain was the *British*; now represented by the Welsh of Wales, and, in the last century, by the Cornish of Cornwall.

The original language of *North* Britain was the *Erse* or *Gaelic*; now represented by the *Erse* or *Gaelic* of the *Highlands* of Scotland, of Ireland, and of the Isle of Man.

Both belonged to the *Keltic* family.

But, besides these two, there was a third: the Latin. This was because, when the Germans invaded it, Britain was a Roman Province.

§ 8. The extent to which the Latin was a spoken vernacular language now comes under consideration; for we must know not only that the German was an intrusive language, but the languages upon which it intruded.

Upon this point Beda is our authority; for, although he did not write till near the middle of the eighth century, he gives us the philology of his own time.

The first of the following extracts makes the number of languages *Five*. The second implies that the *Latin* was the language of the Church, rather than the people at large; and, so doing, reduces the true vernaculars to *Four*.

Thus much, for the present, according to the number of the books in which the Divine Law is written, explores and confesses the one and same knowledge of supreme truth in the language of five nations: viz., the *Angles*, the *Britons*, the *Scots*, the *Picts*, and the *Latins*, which from the perusal of the Scriptures is made common to all the others.

In the next he tells us what was the import of the word *Latin*:—

He received in surrender all the nations and provinces of Britain, which are divided into the four languages—that is, of the Britons, the Picts, the Scots, and the Angles.

§ 9. *Rate and date of the introduction and diffusion of the English Language.*—The rate at which the English spread itself over Britain is uncertain; indeed, it is closely connected with a question which is more uncertain still, that of the *time of its first introduction*.

§ 10. The evidence upon this point falls under seven heads.

- a. The coinage of Carausius, and the notice of Mamertinus.
- b. The first notice of the Saxons in *Gaul*.
- c. The first notice of them in, or connected with, *Britain*.
- d. The notice of Eutropius as to the *Littus Saxonicum*.
- e. The subjection of the *Britains* under the Saxons.
- f. The *Angles* of Procopius.
- g. The Mission of St. Augustin.

§ 11. a. *The Franks of Mamertinus.*—In the reign of Diocletian the coast of Gaul was entrusted to a Menapiian named Carausius. The enemies who seem to have been most especially formidable were *Franks*. Carausius, however, betrayed his trust, and succeeded in making himself independent of the government in Rome. As far as the Emperors Diocletian and Maximian were concerned, he kept his position; and medals are still extant on one side of which are stamped the joint Emperors with the inscription: '*Carausius and his brothers*,' and on the other Imperial Peace, Peace of the Empire, or Peace between the Emperors. This recognition, however, was not achieved without a contest.

To this we have an allusion in the following extract from Mamertinus in a Panegyric delivered before Maximian, the colleague of Diocletian in the Empire:—

By so thorough a consent of the immortal Gods, O unconquered Cæsar, has the extermination of all the enemies whom you attacked, and of the *Franks* more especially, been decreed, that even those of your soldiers who, having missed their way on a foggy sea, reached the town of London, destroyed promiscuously and throughout the city the whole remnant of that mercenary multitude of barbarians which, after escaping the battle, sacking the town and attempting flight, was still left—a deed whereby your provincials were not only saved, but delighted by the sight of the slaughter.

This extract gives a Frank army in the parts about London A.D. 290; and its value upon this point is unimpeachable. The evidence is that of a panegyrist, and, as such, cotemporary with the events alluded to; moreover, it is addressed to hearers who had taken part in them. Whether the victory was as glorious as the orator makes it, or whether the arch-pirate Carausius, on whose side the Franks were manifestly engaged, was much injured by it, are matters of minor importance.

But the Franks, though Germans, are neither Angles nor Saxons; neither is their history in Britain from this time at all continuous. Still they are named by Mamertinus; and, what is more to the purpose, the *Saxons* are *not* named by him; either in the extract under notice or elsewhere. Neither are they mentioned by any cotemporary of Mamertinus, or by any historian under the long reign of Diocletian's successor, Constantine the Great.

§ 12. *b. The first notice of the Saxons in Gaul.*—The first notice of the Saxons in Gaul is the *second* notice of them *anywhere*. The only writer who has mentioned them before is Ptolemy. They are, *then*, in *three islands*, and on the Neck of the Cimbric Chersonese (*Holstein*), as we have seen.

The authority now is the Emperor Julian, who not only writes from personal experience, but states that he does so:—

The Franks and *Saxons* of the nations on the Rhine and the Western Sea are the most warlike of nations . . . this I know, not from hear-say alone, which is unsafe, but I have thoroughly learned it by the proof itself (ἀντὶ τοῦτο κερμαθὲν οἷδα).—*Opp.*, ed. *Spanheim*, pp. 34, 56.

§ 13. *c. The Saxons in connection with Britain.*—*The Limes Saxonicus.*—*The Notitia Utriusque Imperii* is referred, from certain points of internal evidence, to the interval between A.D. 369 and A.D. 408. It tells us that there was a tract in Britain called *Limes Saxonicus*; that it was under the administration of a *Comes Limitis Saxonici*, and that it consisted of the sea-board from the Wash to the Southampton Water:—

Sub dispositione viri spectabilis Comititis Limitis Saxonici per Britanniam—

Præpositus numeri Fortensium Othonæ.

Præpositus militum Tungricanorum Dubris.

Præpositus numeri Turnacensium Lemanis.

Præpositus equitum Dalmatarum Branodunensis Branoduno.

Præpositus equitum Stablesianorum Garionnensis Garionno.

Tribunus Cohortis Primæ Vetasiorum Regulbio.

Præpositus Legionis II. Aug. Rutupis.

Præpositus numeri Abulcorum Anderidæ.

Præpositus numeri Exploratorum Portu Adurni.—Cap. lxxi.

There was a similar and corresponding *Littus* in Gaul, in which we find the German word *March* (= *Limes*).

Sub dispositione viri spectabilis Ducis Belgicæ Secundæ

Equites Dalmatæ Marcis in Littore Saxonico.—C. xxxvii. 1.

§ 14. *d. The notice of Carausius by Eutropius, &c.*—*The* preceding extracts have given us *cotemporary* evidence. The present will *not* do so. There are special reasons, however, for submitting it to the reader:—

Carausius apud Bononiam per tractum Belgicæ et Armoricæ pacandum mare accepit, quod Franci et *Saxones* infestabant.—*Eutropius*, ix. 15.

It is well known that a very important use has been made of this passage. With few, if any, exceptions, the histories of England, when they treat of the German Conquest, give very little prominence to the *Littus Saxoni-*

cum; and, when they notice it at all, they generally add that *Saxonicum* need not be supposed to mean 'inhabited by Saxons,' but simply 'harassed, or threatened, by the Saxons,' or 'exposed to the ravages of the Saxons.' That this meaning is, to some degree, a forced one, few deny; but it is probably admitted, on all sides, that, from one point of view, it is not unnecessary. The authority of Bede, supported by that of the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle, makes the history of the German Conquest begin with Hengist and Horsa, Vortigern and Vortimer, and their cotemporaries; and it is clear that if this be the case, the *Littus Saxonicum* must be explained away. This, to say the least, excuses a construction which, under other circumstances, might be condemned as non-natural.

This passage of Eutropius does more. It makes it almost natural. It suggests that the *Littus Saxonicum* may date from the time of Carausius, and that it was because the Franks and Saxons had to be kept away from it, rather than because they occupied it, that it took its name. Whether this would have any definite bearing on the main question is doubtful; because we have seen that, however much, in the first instance, Carausius was opposed to the Franks, he afterwards took them into his service.

But it is the value of Eutropius as an authority for the word *Saxon*, rather than the application of his evidence, that is now under notice; and it is the opinion of the present writer that he took the word *Saxones* as connected with the name of Carausius, not as it was in the time of Carausius himself, but according to the meaning it bore in his own time.

§ 15. There are three periods in the early history of this perplexing word *Saxon* :—

1. That of the Saxons as occupants of the Cimbric Chersonese, in which they are simply items in the geography of Germany, and in no connection whatever with the rest of Europe. This is given in the single notice of Ptolemy.

2. That of the Saxons as formidable seamen during the decline of the Roman Empire, especially along the coasts of Gaul and Britain.

3. That of the Saxons in Germany subsequent to the establishment of the Frank Kingdom.

§ 16. The second period is the one under notice; and I submit that it had *not* begun in the time of Carausius. That there may have been Saxons among the pirates against whom Carausius was employed is likely. It is also likely that the Saxons, single-handed, may have been as formidable as the Franks themselves. But it is certain that, in the Panegyric of Mamertinus, no such name as *Saxon* is to be found. The difference between the Saxon element in a piratical population and the other elements had yet to be made. As far as our evidence goes, Julian is the first who does this. He is the future Emperor of the *East*; and it is in the writers of the Eastern, rather than the Western Empire, that it is found. By the time of Eutropius their ravages had become frequent and persistent, and, when he wrote, the name of Saxon had become familiar in Constantinople. Under this influence, then, it is submitted that Eutropius wrote; identifying the Saxons of his own time with the marauders of the time of Carausius. This is Gibbon's opinion, who writes that Eutropius 'used the language of his own times.'

This is why, when every other piece of evidence in the present work has been (upon principle) given only when it is cotemporary with the event, this notice of Eutropius has been recognized. It is *not* the evidence of a cotemporary. If it were, it would be evidence of extraordinary value; for it would put the state of both Gaul and Britain in the time of Carausius in a much clearer light than that under which we find it; and, what is more, it would tell us not only that the term *Saxon* was then in use, but what were the relations of the men who bore it to the British and Gallic coasts. It is *not*, however, evidence of this *kind*, but of a much inferior character.

§ 17. *c. The Subjection of the Britains under the Saxons.*

—The settlement of a German population in Britain is one thing; the evacuation of the island by the Romans is another. Yet they are closely connected. Germans on the soil of Britain we have already found; but Germans as the dominant population, Germans unchecked by either the legions or the navy of Rome, we have yet to find.

Who the Saxons of the *Saxon Shore* actually were is uncertain. The ordinary meaning of the term is, undoubtedly, a coast occupied by a *Saxon population*; but, in the present case, it is (as we have seen) held to mean a coast threatened or harassed by the Saxons, and, as such, defended against them.

It is nowhere suggested that this is the natural import of the term; it is only maintained that it is, if needed, a legitimate one. And, provided we take the accounts of Bede and the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle as genuine history, it is needed. It is needed if the accounts of the Hengists, Ellas, Cerdics, and other Anglo-Saxon heroes are to be taken not only as permanent settlements, but as the *first of the kind*; and that so exclusively as to make it necessary to put upon the words *Littus Saxonicum* a construction which would never suggest itself spontaneously, and of which no second instance has ever been adduced.

Whether these two statements be accurate or the contrary is a matter upon which the reader must judge for himself. He need only understand, as a preliminary, that it is in no respect a point of scholarship. Whether *Coast* or *Shore* be the better translation of the word *Littus* is a matter of indifference. '*Saxonicum*' there is but one way of translating. Hence, in respect to the import of the four words, there is no difference. We can do nothing with the words *Littus Saxonicum* in Latin, that we cannot do with *Saxon Shore* (or *Coast*) in English. If '*harassed*' or '*threatened*' or '*frequented by the Saxons*' be a forced interpretation of '*Saxon Shore*' as an English term, it is

equally forced in the Latin *Littus Saxonicum*. Those who have noticed the way in which several influential writers usher in this secondary sense of '*Saxonicum*' will not condemn the present remark as superfluous. Either consciously or unconsciously, a great many of them suggest that in the Latin phrase there is more latitude and pliability than in the English.

§ 18. *e. The Evacuation of Britain by the Romans.*—The following extract from Prosper Tiro is one that, in the mind of the present writer, has had scant justice done to it.

The date is A.D. 441.

The Britains, up to this time torn by various massacres and events, are reduced to the dominion of the *Saxons*.

Britanniæ, usque ad hoc tempus variis cladibus eventibusque laceratæ in ditionem *Saxonum* rediguntur.

I submit that these *Saxons* of Prosper Tiro are the Saxons of the *Littus Saxonicum*.

The date is earlier than that assigned to Hengist and Horsa, but it is later than that of the withdrawal of the legions by Honorius, A.D. 409. That Honorius withdrew the exclusively military legions, or rather that they were withdrawn by Constantine and the British pretenders who fought their battles in Gaul, is likely enough. The question is whether he withdrew the dockyards, the arsenals, and those sailors who chose to remain where they were; and on this point there is not a particle of evidence. Failing this, we must look to the *Littus* of Gaul; and here it seems to have been left as it was. At any rate we hear of the Saxons of Bayeux—the *Saxones Bajocassini* of Gregory of Tours, and of others—long after the Imperial character of the *Littus* has disappeared, and long after the Merovingian Franks had become strong enough to keep off intruders. Still, it must be from either fresh intruders from the North, or from the remainder of the *Littus*, that the Saxons of Gaul, of the Fifth, Sixth, and Seventh centuries, are to be deduced.

The word *Britannia* during the Fifth century means not only Britain, but Brittany, or *Armorica*. Hence, it is probable that these two countries are the *Britannice* of the extract. Still, there is in Britain a *Britannia Prima*, and a *Britannia Secunda*; while even in Gaul there is, besides the *Armorican Brittany*, a notice of certain *Britanni* on the Loire. It will be seen in the sequel that there are other ambiguous words connected with this period.

The gist of these remarks is to put the evidence of Prosper Tiro, *at least*, on a level with that of Beda and the Saxon Chronicle; and if the present work were one upon the general history of England during the fourth and fifth centuries, instead of a mere introduction to the details of the structure of the language, more would be said on the subject. Objections would be anticipated, and the result of the difference between the two authorities indicated. As it is, however, the solitary date of Prosper Tiro is simply preferred to the details of Beda and the writers who follow him.

§ 19. The well-known letter to the Roman general Ætius, in his third consulship, sometimes quoted as ‘The Groans of the Britons,’ in most works (and in none more than my own) finds its place, A.D. 449. It is now excluded from the text, and that purposely. This is to show that the omission is not accidental. It runs thus:—

To Ætius, thrice Consul, the groans of the Britons. The barbarians drive us to the sea. The sea drives us back to the barbarians. Between these arise two sorts of deaths. We are either slaughtered or drowned.

Ætio ter consuli gemitus Britannorum. Repellunt nos barbari ad mare; repellit nos mare ad barbaros. Inter hæc oriuntur duo genera funerum. Aut jugulamur, aut mergimur.

It is doubtful whether the Britons of this epistle, instead of being Britons of *Britannia*, are not the Bretons of *Armorica* (Brittany). When Ætius was in Gaul, St. Germanus was in Britain. On his return he passed through *Armorica*. The *Armoricans* at that time had offended Ætius, and he sent his ally, the barbarous king of the *Alani*, to chastise them. The barbarians, then, are the *Alani*.

Read from this point of view, the letter has a significance which it

wants if we read it as an application from Britain. The Britons are pent up between the enemy on the land on one side and the sea on the other. This might, or might not, have been the case with the Saxons. The Alans, however, *must* have pressed on the Britons from the *land* side, and the more they pressed westwards, the more the latter retreated, the more stringent the alternative of the surrounded population would become.

§ 20. *f.* The following extract gives us a new name—that of the *Frisians*. It is a name that has long been recognized, and one that we may undoubtedly add to those of the Angles, the Saxons, and the Jutes. It is not to be found in Beda. In the following notice where it *is* found there is no such word as *Saxon*. The inference from this, that some Saxons were Frisians under another name (and *vice versâ*), suggests itself at once; and, if we knew no more about the Frisians than what we learn from our present authority, it might pass without comment. Indeed, it is probable that, to some extent, such is the case. There is much, however, connected with the Frisians which points to the Angles and the Danes rather than to the Saxons.

From Procopius.

Three nations extremely populous occupy the island of Britain. One king is at the head of each. The names for these nations are *Angli*, *Phrissones*, and (of the same name as the island) *Britons*. Such is the manifest populousness of these nations, that every year, in great numbers, they migrate from thence, and with their wives and children go over to the Franks.

Βριτανίαν δὲ τὴν νῆσον ἔθνη τρία πολυανθρωπότατα ἔχουσι. Βασιλεὺς δὲ εἰς αὐτῶν ἐκάστῳ ἐφέστηκεν. Ὀνόματα δὲ κεῖται τοῖς ἔθνεσι τούτοις Ἀγγεῖλοι καὶ Φρισσόνες καὶ οἱ τῇ νήσῳ ὀμάνυμοι Βρίττωνες· τοσαύτῃ δὲ ἡ τῶνδε τῶν ἔθνων πολυανθρωπία φαίνεται ὅσα ὥστε ἀνὰ πᾶν ἔτος κατὰ πολλοὺς εἰθένδε μεταναστάντες ζῆν γυναῖξί καὶ παῖσιν ἐς ἑβράγγους χωροῦσιν.

Bellum Gothicum, iv. 20.

§ 21. *g.* *The Mission of St. Augustin.*—This is loosely identified with the introduction of Christianity in England—in *England*, as opposed to *Britain*; for into Britain, as a Roman province, Christianity had found its way before. The time is the last three years of the seventh century, say

A.D. 600. Ethelbert is king of Kent; his queen is a Frank princess. Gregory I., then Pope, enjoins a Frank mission to promulgate the Christianity of the Franks. The Frank King sends interpreters, and St. Augustin is at the head of the mission. The evidence of this is the Papal letters. They did not reach England till later, when Nothelm brought them over. Now Nothelm was an early cotemporary of Beda's, and as such belongs to the latter half of the seventh century; and, so doing, brings us to the time of Beda himself.

Hence, A.D. 697 there is no doubt as to the fact of the mother-tongue of the present English having become thoroughly established in Britain; in the southern parts at least. It was a language, too, intelligible to the Franks; at least to the Franks of the western division of the Frank kingdom.

§ 22. If full justice is to be done both to Beda and the earlier authorities with whom he is at variance, his account may be divided into three parts.

1. *The Century in which he wrote.*—Here he writes of what was to be found in England during the time of his own life; and, doing this, writes with an authority which it would be vain to impugn.

2. *The Seventh Century.*—This gives us, within a few years, the introduction of Christianity and several of its immediate results, one of which would be the use of the Latin language as that of the Church, and (unless it existed before) the use of the alphabet. Under these conditions we get the elements of a truly historical record; and, although we have no remains of it, it is probable that Beda may have had the opportunity of availing himself of it. More than this, for the latter half of the century, there were the early cotemporaries of Beda, to whom he may have applied. This we know to have been the case. We know, too, that there was a fair amount of literary activity during the period. One of the Christian duties of the recent converts to Christianity in England was that of

preaching the Gospel to their near kinsmen on the Continent, who, in the parts north of the Rhine and Ems, were still pagans. This they performed honourably. They called the Germans of these districts *Old Saxons*; an important name, because it shows that the descent of the English from them was recognized. It is also a convenient name, because it means the Saxons of the Continent as opposed to the Saxons of England. These latter, even in Beda's time, are called *Anglo-Saxons*.

Between Beda and his cotemporaries we get trustworthy evidence for at least the latter half of the seventh century, especially as the cotemporaries whom we appeal to are not imaginary or merely possible ones. Beda himself tells us, not only that there were some of them to whom he applies, but he tells us who they were and upon what points they instructed him. Thus he mentions by name Albinus and Nothelm for Kent; Bishop Daniel for Sussex and the Isle of Wight; the monks of Lestingham for Mercia and part of Essex; with Cyneberct and others for Lincoln. For the province of Northumberland Beda was his own authority.

For the *first* half, however, of the century the value of Beda's statements decreases, though not to any great degree. There is still, without doubt, some learning in the country, and some records. Hence, when Beda writes that Eadwin, king of Northumberland, defeats Ethelfrith, and soon after invades the little kingdom of Elmet (in the West Riding of Yorkshire), and that Elmet is, then, not only independent, but British, we should not only not demur to his evidence, but adopt it as one of the best statements we have for calculating the *rate* at which our language extended itself.

This, then, is a *third* point in the history of our language upon which Beda speaks with authority. The other two we have are (1) the four (or five) languages of Britain, and (2) the existence of the Jutes in Kent and the Isle of Wight (for which see § 25).

The *fourth* point, however, is the most important of all. It is in Beda that we first meet the word *Angle* in connection with England and the English.

§ 23. *Beda's Evidence for the Sixth and Fifth Centuries.*—For what Beda tells us here, especially for the *fifth* century, we must look less to the account he delivers than to the question as to how he got his information. The middle part of the period is one of almost total darkness. The time for the influences of the early English Christianity with its concomitant civilization has not yet come; and the time for information from the Latin writers of the last days of Roman greatness has gone by. That Beda took more than ordinary pains to obtain his information from his older cotemporaries we have seen; but we know nothing of the sources on which *they* relied. The century and a half under notice is nearly destitute, not only of historical records, but of statements capable of either contradiction or confirmation. To say that nothing whatever can be found for the period would be an overstatement.

§ 24. Farther than this in the way of cotemporary evidence we cannot go. But Beda must also be considered as a geographer; for it is manifest that, in the following extract, there are two questions involved—viz. that of the particular Germans who came over to Britain, and that of the particular districts of Germany from which they came:—

Advenerant autem de tribus Germaniæ populis fortioribus, id est de Saxonibus, Anglis, Jutis. De Jutarum origine sunt Cantuarii et Vectuarii, hoc est ea gens quæ Vectam tenet insulam, et ea quæ usque hodie, in provincia Occidentalium Saxonum, Jutarum natio nominatur, posita contra ipsam insulam Vectam. De Saxonibus, id est ea regione quæ nunc Antiquorum Saxonum cognominatur, venerunt Orientales Saxones, Meridiani Saxones, Occidentales Saxones. Porro de Anglis, hoc est de illa patria quæ Angulus dicitur, et ab eo tempore usque hodie manere desertas inter provincias Jutarum et Saxonum perhibetur, Orientales Angli, Mediterranei Angli, Mercii, tota Northumbrorum progenies.

The extent to which these notices by Beda were recognized, not merely as sufficient but as standard authorities,

may be seen by their reappearance, in the same form, in Alfred and elsewhere; even out of England. Nor were there, until the tenth and eleventh centuries, the data for criticizing them, even in the parts which were most open to objection; these being the parts connected with the geography of the Angle and Jute districts.

§ 25. That there may have been *Angles* in the *Angulus* is not unlikely. But the *Angulus* of Beda is the present district of Anglen, a nook of land, no larger than the county of Rutland, lying on the eastern side of the duchy of Sleswick between the Slie and Flensburg. Some Angles may have come from this district, but it would be wrong to treat it as the true Angle part of Germany, when both Tacitus and Ptolemy, our only authorities, place it on the middle Elbe.

The Jutes of Beda, in the opinion of the present writer, were not Jutlanders from Denmark, but *Goths* from the opposite coast of Gaul, then a powerful *Gothic* kingdom.

The chief point, however, in the comparison of the evidence of Beda and that of the earlier writers, is the extent to which one *excludes* the other. If the Saxons of the times of the Hengists and Ellas are to be not only so many Saxons on English ground, but so exclusively the first of their nation as to justify us in putting constrained constructions upon cotemporary texts, the criticism is sure to become unduly one-sided; and that this one-sided character characterizes the early history of England throughout few deny.

§ 26. *The Danes, or Northmen, in Britain.*—The importance of the Danish influence in England may be measured by the trouble it created in the reigns of Alfred and his successors, and the culmination of the Danish power in that of Canute.

Who were the Danes? What was the date of their first settlements? In what way have they affected our language? These are the questions that are more especially connected with them.

In respect to the first, we may say that they were the Danes of Jutland and the Danish Isles. But they were this and a great deal more. They were the Danes of Denmark proper, and they were the Norwegians of Norway as well.

The date of their first recorded inroads is to be found in the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle, A.D. 787.

How far they have affected our language is the third question, and it is full of difficulties. It would be no difficult task to make lists of one, two, three, four, five, or even more, hundreds of words which are either Norwegian or Danish. But, unless it can be shown that they are not German, such lists would be worthless; and the proof upon this point is the proverbially difficult task of proving a negative proposition.

This, however, applies to *common* names only; with *proper* names it is different. The termination *-by*, in words like Grimsby, &c., is a *Danish* word. *Caster*, in the place of *Chester*, is a Danish form. *Skip-*, *Carl*, *Orm-*, and *Kirk*, imply Danish occupancy. Hence, where the English parts of Britain give us Charlton, Dorchester, Shipton, and Wormshead, the Danish forms are Carlby, Ancaster, Skipton, Ormshead, and Ormskirk. Any ordinary map supplies the list of these. They are the most numerous in Yorkshire, especially in the East and North Ridings; but Yorkshire is an inordinately large county. For its size, Lincolnshire gives us the most. Then, at a great distance, Leicester, Nottingham, Derby, and Northampton. We lose the word *by* in the south at Rugby, and on the north in Durham—*Raby*. It is to be found, in patches, in Norfolk and Suffolk. Elsewhere, on the eastern side of England, they are either undiscovered or undiscoverable. From Yorkshire, however, they follow the western feeders of the Ouse to its watershed, which they cross, and then re-appear in Cumberland, Westmoreland, Lancashire, Cheshire, the Isle of Man, and North Wales; at least in such names as *Orm's Head*.

In Ireland, we have a new instrument of criticism. In *Carlingford*, *Strangford*, and *Wexford*, the final syllable has not its ordinary import. It means an arm of the sea; in short, it is the Norwegian *Fjord*. And so it is in the *Firth of Forth* in Scotland. In this country the distribution of the *bys* is remarkable. We have it at *Duncansby Head* in the extreme north, and we have it in *Eskdale* and *Anandale* in the south-west. Otherwise the *bys* are exceptional. As *proper* names, these give us a long list. But they are not *common* names. They are all proper names, the names of geographical localities.

It may be expected that where we find these, we shall find *common* names also. But such is not the case. If true Danish common names exist in one part of Great Britain more than another, it is in Scotland; but that is just where the local names give us the fewest signs of Danish occupancy. This anomaly, however, has been explained. Mr. Worsaae, in his '*Danes and Northmen*,' has shown that it is only the Danes of Denmark proper that exhibit this inordinate partiality for villages ending in *-by*, and that in Norway they are rare. In Iceland, pre-eminently a Norwegian colony, they are not to be found. The admitted inference is that it was Norwegians who assailed and circumnavigated Scotland, but Danes who assailed *England*; and, from the parts about *Kirkby Lonsdale*, &c., crossed the watershed, and gave us the numerous *-bys* of Cumberland and Selkirkshire.

This, at least, is the inference from the distribution of the termination. It is far more Danish than Norwegian, as may be seen from comparing a map of Iceland and Norway with one of Jutland or Denmark.

With this division in geography between the proper Danish and the Norwegian settlements, we no longer expect that, as a matter of course, they will agree in time. Lincolnshire is preeminently Danish.

In parts of Caithness, and the Orkneys, the language was Norwegian. In Shetland a Norse dialect was spoken in the last century.

§ 27. The earliest specimens of the English language, so far as they are dated at all, belong to the first half of the eighth century. They are known as the *Fragment of Ceadmon* and the *Death-bed Verses of Beda*.

Ceadmon was born at Whitby. The long and important poem which has come down to us in his name is in the *West-Saxon* dialect; and this has engendered the notion that the original has been lost and re-cast. The following lines, however, which have been preserved by Beda, are admitted to be genuine; for of Beda Ceadmon was an early cotemporary.

*Older Text.**Later Text.*

Nu scylun hergan . . .	Nu we sceolon herigea
Hefaen ricaes uard . . .	Heofon-rices weard
Metudæs mæcte . . .	Metodes mihte
End his modgithanc . . .	And his modgethanc
Uere uuldur fader . . .	Werc wuldor fæder
Sue he uundra gihuaes . . .	Sva he wuldres gehwæs
Eci drihten . . .	Ecé drihtin
Ord stelidæ . . .	Ord onstealde
He ærist scopa . . .	He ærest scóp
Elda barnum . . .	Eorðan bearnan
Heben til hrofe . . .	Heofon tó rofe
Halg sceper . . .	Hálig scyppend
Tha middun-geard . . .	Da middangeard
Moncynnes uard . . .	Moncynnes weard
Eci drihten . . .	Ece drihten
Æfter tiade . . .	Æfter teóde
Firum foldu . . .	Firum foldan
Freá allmectig . . .	Freá ælmihtig.

The Death-bed Verses of Beda.

Fore the neidfaerae . . .	Before the necessary journey
Naenig uuirthit . . .	No one becomes
Thoc snottura . . .	Wiser of thought
Than him tharf sie . . .	Than him need be
To ymbhyecanne . . .	To think about
Aer his hionongae . . .	Before his hence-going
Huaet his gastae . . .	What for his spirit
Godaes æththa yflaes . . .	Of good or evil
Æfter deothdaege . . .	After death-day
Dæmed unieorthae . . .	Doomed shall be.

These, however, partly from their shortness, and partly from their containing few of the inflections which give us the best characteristics of the Northern dialect, are of more importance in the history of Anglo-Saxon Literature in general than as specimens of any particular dialect: though the dialect of both Bede and Ceadmon was the *Northern* or *Northumbrian*.

§ 28. That this Northumbrian dialect was the first cultivated is probable. By the end, however, of the Ninth Century, it is, as compared with the West-Saxon, obsolete as a vehicle of literature. Nearly all that we know of it is from *Glosses*. Of these:

1. The Glosses of the *Rushworth Gospels* are referred to the end of the Ninth or the beginning of the Tenth Century.
2. The Glosses of the *Durham* or *Lindisfarn Gospels*.
3. The Glosses of the *Durham Ritual*.
4. Inscriptions in Runic characters near Ruthwell in Dumfriesshire, and Bewcastle in Cumberland.
5. Glosses on the *Psalms*—known as the '*Psalter*,' but not universally admitted to be *Northumbrian*.

§ 29. For nearly the whole of the eleventh, twelfth, and thirteenth centuries no specimens of any dialect north of the Humber are known: yet the Northern boundary of Northumberland is, not the Tyne, but the Forth. After, however, an interval of 300 years it will, again, appear in the County of Durham. The Northern Version of the '*Cursor Mundi*' is a valuable specimen of a literature which is common in the Old English period, viz., an adaptation of the dialect of one part of England to that of another part. We can scarcely call works of this kind translations, yet they are more than mere transcriptions. The work under notice is one of these; and that without doubt, since the author expressly tells us as much.

In a writte this ilke I fand
Himself it wrought, I understand,
In suthron Englys was it drawn,

And I have turned it till urr awn
 Language of the Northern lede,
 That can non other Englis rede.—*Cursor Mundi*.

This, for its date and place, is easy to read: in other words it is very modern. But it is also very Scotch. Indeed, the classical time of the true national literature of Scotland is now about to begin. During the Thirteenth Century, however, the Northumbrian dialect of the middle period will still continue to be represented by compositions from the district between the Tyne and Humber, rather than between the Tweed and Forth. I write between the 'Tweed and Forth,' rather than between the 'Tyne and Forth,' because, in the way of records, Northumberland, as the *County* so called, contributes little or nothing. Yorkshire belongs to the old Northumberland; and of this Durham is the representative County. This means, of course, that what is here treated as Northumbrian English is, to a great extent, Lowland Scotch. To distinguish this from the present Gaelic of the Highlands, the Scotch themselves called their language *English*; and that during the Fifteenth Century; when, as far as politics and nationality went, the difference between the Scotch and the English was a matter of life and death. At the time of the Reformation the word *Scotch* took its present meaning—not much before.

A little later than the *Cursor Mundi* in its Northern form comes Hampole's *Pricke of Conscience*, along with other works by the same writer. These represent the Northumbrian of Yorkshire, for the parts about Doncaster, and they are quite as Modern, and English, and quite as North British, or Scotch, as the *Cursor Mundi*.

§ 30. With the Fourteenth Century begins the classical time of North British literature; English by name, Scotch in reality. This is introduced by James I., the cotemporary of Henry IV. in England. Dunbar, who divides with Burns the honour of being the great poet of Scotland, continues it; and it is further continued till the times of

the Reformation, by Gawain Douglass and Sir Thomas Lyndesay; but it begins to be called *English*. After this it is Scotch, more or less Anglicised. Wyntoun, Blind Harry, and Barbour, are early coteremporaries of James the First. No known Scotch *manuscript* is older than 1397.

The Northumbrian dialect has been considered at length, because it has certain perplexing peculiarities of its own. It begins early, but it breaks off early. It then presents us with a long blank. It then comes to its climax of cultivation in the fifteenth century; after which it begins (in Scotland) to be Anglicised. Moreover, though it is in politics, nationality, and geography Scotch, it is called, and is, *English*.*

§ 31. *The West-Saxon Dialect*.—This, as the dominant and classical language of the times before the Norman Conquest, began with the latter half of the ninth century. The few examples of our earliest English that go further back have been noticed already, and they were Northumbrian rather than West-Saxon, though not in a very decided form. Rich as the West-Saxon is in detail, the greater part of its literature is dateless and anonymous. But two great names represent it, those of Alfred and Ælfric.

Its ascendancy begins with the reign of Alfred. It ends in wholly displacing the Northumbrian. It is continued with diminished lustre till the thirteenth century, when we first meet with undoubted *Midland*, or Mercian, compositions. It is continued through the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries, concurrently, however, with the Northumbrian and Midland. It passes into the condition of a provincial form of speech about A.D. 1550, or, to speak more generally, at the time when the two new influences of the Printing Press and the Reformation came into action.

* All the complications connected with the thorough *English* character of the *Northumbrian English* of the *South of Scotland* are admirably unravelled in Dr. Murray's *Dialect of the Southern Counties of Scotland*, 1873.

The West-Saxon chief works of the thirteenth and the earlier part of the fourteenth centuries are :—

Layamon's Brut ; from Worcestershire, or the Worcestershire and the Gloucestershire border.

The Ancren Biwle ; from Wiltshire.

Robert of Gloucester ; from Gloucestershire.

Trevisa, a cotemporary of Chaucer's, is also West-Saxon in its original form. But when Caxton reprints his work, he has to adapt it to the current form of speech ; though not to any very great extent.

Chaucer is West-Saxon (we may now say Western) ; at least as opposed to Northumbrian.

There are other West-Saxon writers of this period of less importance. But one work is of special importance. It was written in Canterbury A.D. 1340. It shows that, though Kent is the most eastern county south of the Thames, its dialect was *Western*. The *Ayenbit of Inwit*, or *Remorse of Conscience*, is its title. It is, doubtless, to some extent, a provincial, rather than a classical, composition. The spelling, however, makes it look more provincial than it really is ; for it is that of the present provincial spelling for Devonshire : *i.e.* with *z* and *v* for *s* and *f*.

§ 32. *The Midland, or Mercian, Dialect*.—The *Ormulum* is the work of a writer named Orm ; and this points to the Danish parts of England.

Havelok the Dane does the same. Neither are either strictly West-Saxon or strictly Northumbrian. But the Mercian, or Midland, characteristics are of a negative rather than a positive character.

Robert of Bourne was a native of Lincolnshire. He is a cotemporary of Robert of Gloucester and of Hampole, so that the three together represent the three dialects, now written concurrently. They all belong to the reigns of Henry III. and Edward I., *i.e.* the beginning of the fifteenth century.

What the Midland, or Mercian, literature more espe-

cially resembles (for we have already remarked that its characters are negative, and may now add that its geographical position is intermediate between the two extremes) is the literary, classical, or standard English of the present time; though as a standard literary language it does not take its place until later.

This is only another way of saying that the present literary English is not the lineal descendant of the classical West-Saxon. And we may go further. We may add that it is less like the West-Saxon than it is like the Northumbrian, but it is not Northumbrian. It is Midland or Mercian.

§ 33. These three leading dialects have each their own history. With the dialects of Shropshire, Cheshire, Lancashire, Westmoreland, Cumberland, and the West Riding of Yorkshire this is not the case. None of them have ever become classical. Neither is their relation to the other three groups manifest. Nor should we expect it to be so. It varies with the frontier. They have been called *West Midland*. The name, however, is merely provisional. It is only certain that they have mixed and heterogeneous characteristics.

§ 34. It is customary to cast the English language into chronological divisions, or, as they are called, *Stages*. At first the process began with the broad distinction between the times of Alfred and his immediate successors, and those of the modern writer. This made to some extent the Anglo-Saxon one language, and the ordinary English another. The difference, however, was that the former was what is called a Dead, the other a Living language. But where the history of a language, and indeed the language itself, is continuous, the distinction between the two vanishes. No one who bestows any thought upon the subject can imagine that because one language is called Dead and the other Living, or because one is called Anglo-Saxon and the other English, they are different languages in the way that Latin differs from the German, or the German from the French. The English of the present time is simply the Anglo-Saxon in a later,

the Anglo-Saxon the English in an earlier form or stage. Nevertheless, the fact that the one is understood at once, while the other has to be learned, is a fact that conveys (along with a considerable amount of likeness) a difference of some kind or other. It is not, however, the difference between two parallel and distinct languages.

As languages begin to be studied in their intermediate stages, this difference ceases to be felt; and when any notable changes take place, divisions and sub-divisions suggest themselves, and *stages* of a language are the result.

When this takes place there will always be two questions. Where is the division to be made? and what is the name to be applied to it? It is too much to expect that any line of demarcation, or any series of names, can be wholly satisfactory, or wholly permanent. The characteristics by which one stage is determined may change their value; or new principles of division may be established. There is, beyond all doubt, a tendency to change either the actual divisions, or the names which indicate them (one or both) at the present time.

§ 35. The divisions and names, however, which were adopted by the scholars of the last generation should be known; and, whether they are to be upheld or rejected, the principles upon which they were given should be understood. These were—

1. The *Anglo-Saxon* stage, from the earliest known compositions, of English origin, to the Norman Conquest and a little beyond it.

2. The *Semi-Saxon*.—Middle of the 11th to the middle of the 12th century (there or thereabouts).

3. The *Old English*.—This means the English of the latter part of the reign of Henry III., and the reign of the first two Edwards (there or thereabouts).

4. The *Middle English*.—From Chaucer to the time of Henry VIII. (there or thereabouts).

5. The *New, or Recent, or Modern English*.—From Henry

VIII. (say Sir Thomas More) to the time at which the divisions were suggested.

Of these terms, *Semi-Saxon* is the newest.

§ 36. We may approve of these or we may not; but, as they are still current, we must understand them. Otherwise there will not be a work on English philology of ten years' standing that we shall be able to read with ease.

We must know, too, how certain works, especially for the three middle periods, are to be distributed.

§ 37. The first important composition which is called transitional or *Semi-Saxon* is *the concluding part of the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*—especially the reign of Stephen, the last of the kings it contains. This is reasonably referred to the earlier part of the reign of his successor Henry II. But it is a difficult work to fix. In the first, it may be somewhat more Anglo-Saxon than it would be were it not the continuation of a genuine Anglo-Saxon composition. In the second, it is considered to be, to some extent, Mercian rather than pure West-Saxon.

Layamon's Brut.—West-Saxon (as we have seen) in dialect, *Semi-Saxon* in date.

The Ancren Riwele.—West-Saxon (as aforesaid) in dialect, *Semi-Saxon* in date.

The Ormulum.—Mercian in dialect, generally considered *Semi-Saxon* in date. It has been thought by some that its language is too modern for the antiquity assigned to it. The modern character, however, may be due less to date than to the dialect.

§ 38. *Of Old English*, as opposed to *Semi-Saxon*, the *Proclamation of Henry III. to the People of Huntingdonshire* passes for the earliest specimen. The date is 1258.

The following are the titles of the more important ones. They are selected from a Glossary* especially dedi-

* *A Glossarial Index to the Printed English Language of the Thirteenth Century*. Published by the Philological Society. Edited by H. Coleridge. 1859.

cated to English of the *thirteenth* century ; which shows how decidedly the term *Old English* excludes the *Semi-Saxon* on one side, and English of Chaucer's time on the other.

Havelok the Dane	The Owl and Nightingale
The Early English Psalter	Robert of Gloucester, &c.

Havelok the Dane is Mercian ; the Early English Psalter is Northumbrian. The rest are chiefly Western.

§ 39. This division is very artificial ; and it is not likely that it will be permanent. Neither will the term *Old English* as applied to it : inasmuch as those who disapprove of the word *Anglo-Saxon* propose the word *Old English* as its substitute. However, the Proclamation to the Men of Huntingdonshire gave a convenient date ; while the scantiness of our literature in the reign of Edward II. made the conclusion of the division pretty definite. This is about all that can be said in favour of it.

§ 40. *Middle English*.—This division, so far as it gives us such writers as Chaucer and Mandeville in contrast to Robert of Gloucester and Layamon, is natural ; and it is probable that, as Chaucer is read by the English of the present period, the division is a convenient one. But when Chaucer dies, England, as compared with Scotland, is, at least, on the decline. The time of the three Henrys is one when the West-Saxon has ceased to represent the Anglo-Saxon period, and when the Midland has yet to become the literary English of the present time. For the time of the four Henrys (or that of the five Jameses), the best middle English is the English of Scotland. This is doubtless compatible with the use of the term ; but it was not the meaning that was given to it by the scholars who originally applied it.

§ 41. It is probable that this arrangement will not satisfy many of my readers—least of all those who have gone through the preceding remarks on the Dialects of our language. Indeed, more than thirty years ago it was

complained of by the earlier investigators of them; and now, when each of our three leading dialects is acknowledged to have a corresponding literary language, the impropriety of massing them together as one, and treating them as uniform in their continuity, is manifest.

§ 42. What we know of the English *in general* is that it is the mother-tongue of three well-marked forms of speech out of which three literary languages have grown. One of these is the West-Saxon, one the Scotch, and one the present literary English. There is also a fourth class of indefinite limits, but which has never culminated in a literary language; viz., that of the north-western counties of South Britain. Each of those has its peculiar and proper history, which may or may not be susceptible of divisions in the way of growth or development.* But the stages of the *three* cannot be dealt with as if they were *one*.

§ 43. Still we know something akin to the stages of our language in general. We know that there are certain epochs at which the language in mass of the whole island was, or might be, affected.

Such a one is the time from the reign of Diocletian, at the end of the third century, to the middle of the fifth, when we know that some Germans of some sort or other had set foot in our island.

Such a one is the time from the middle of the fifth century to the beginning of the seventh, when the history of our language was a blank. But we know that it was to a great extent German.

Such a one was the time from A.D. 600 to the death of Beda; for which we have a few lines in English, and these we know belong to the *northern* rather than to the *southern* form of speech.

Such a one is the time from the death of Beda to that

* For the characteristics of the Middle English Dialect, see Dr. Morris's *Specimens of Early English*, and Prefaces to his Editions in the 'Early English Text Society.'

of Alfred, where we know that the northern literature is declining. Under Alfred and his successors the classical *West-Saxon* literature was formed. But a fresh influence was introduced by the Norman Conquest.

§ 44. From the Norman Conquest to the death of Richard II. there is a period out of which many subordinate stages may be made. There are the reigns of the two Williams, Stephen, Henry II., Richard, and John, in which the *West-Saxon* still is the predominating dialect; but there is very little of it. Then, under Henry III., there are compositions other than *West-Saxon*. Those that are *Northumbrian* are representatives of an old, though diminished literature in a new shape after a long arrest. Hence we have the *Northumbrian* form of speech re-appearing, but with no continuity in its history.

There are, also, *Midland* dialects, which are represented in this century, but they have no anterior history.

Meanwhile the *West-Saxon* declines.

For this period there is no continuity for any one of the forms of speech of which the English language consists; nor can we expect one of the language in general.

§ 45. In the Fifteenth Century—under the three Henrys—the English Language is no longer represented by the *West-Saxon*, but by the *Northumbrian* of Scotland; which is itself destined to be displaced by the *Mercian* of the middle district of England.

Upon both of these the Invention of Printing acts as an influence of inordinate power, and brings us to something like the present English. But this is the history of a third form of speech, in the history of which the *Northumbrian* and *West-Saxon* forms of speech are left out of sight.

§ 46. '*Anglo-Saxon*' as opposed to '*Old English*.'—'*Anglo-Saxon*' has till within the last half century been used generally, and perhaps universally, as the name for that stage of the English Language which preceded the Norman Conquest.

It has meant the English of England in its oldest known form, and it has meant nothing more. That it has denoted a different language from the most modern form of the present language has never been imagined. But, of late, there has arisen the opinion that it has a tendency to engender the notion that the Anglo-Saxon is one language, and the English another; or, at least, that it is a term which disguises the identity and the continuity of the two. It is difficult for a mere looker-on to say how far this error is real, or how far imaginary; whether it is held by the many or the few; and finally whether it is held by those whose obliquity of understanding need be humoured. It is certain, however, that no small amount of attention has been paid to the question; and that the claims of the term 'Old English' have been advocated with some learning, and with much zeal.

As early as 1852 a writer in the *Gentleman's Magazine* (April and May) proposed the following change: that—

- | | | | |
|----|-----------------------|-------------------------------|------------------------|
| 1. | From A.D. 550 to 1150 | the Language should be called | <i>Old English.</i> |
| 2. | " 1150 to 1350 | " " | <i>Early English.</i> |
| 3. | " 1350 to 1550 | " " | <i>Middle English.</i> |
| 4. | " 1550 to 1852 | " " | <i>New English.</i> |

That the use of the term *Anglo-Saxon* in its original sense has any chance of being abandoned, is, in the opinion of the present writer, improbable. Its original sense was the 'Saxon of *England*' as opposed to the 'Saxon of *Germany*;' and this last is called *Old Saxon*, or the language *Antiquorum Saxonum*, by Bede himself. Paulus Diaconus uses *Anglo-Saxon* for the *Saxon of England*.

As the name of the English of Alfred and Ælfric—the classical or standard English of the times before the Norman Conquest—it can be more easily dispensed with; and so it can for the few extant remains of the *Northern* dialect. For these the terms *West-Saxon* and *Northumbrian* may be used with advantage; and Kemble, for one influen-

tial writer, has already used them. For the *Midland* dialects the word has never been used; inasmuch as there are no early *Midland* compositions.

§ 47. But, besides this, there is the new term *Semi-Saxon*. The class itself being divided between two different dialects (for the *Ormulum* is *Mercian*, while the other two are *West-Saxon*), is so little likely to be permanent that the merits of the name scarcely claim investigation.

That the term *Anglo-Saxon* will always be opposed to *Old Saxon* is probable; and it is also probable that, where the more special terms *West-Saxon* or *Northumbrian* are unsuitable, it will hold its ground as the most convenient term in numerous general and indefinite questions. What these are is best known to those who have to investigate them.

When the matter is thus put in the simple form of a question of convenience, there should not be much to say about the comparative merits of the two terms in the abstract. That the existing name for the language is *English* is beyond doubt; but whether it is applicable to every stage and form of the language represented by the occupants of South Britain is a matter on which the Scotch and Americans, not to mention the philologists, have something to say.

That the Lowland Scotch was called English in the fifteenth century to distinguish it from the Gaelic of the Highlands we know; but we also know that it is not called *English* now.

Semi-Saxon is, in my mind, a useful word. It certainly favours the notion that *Anglo-Saxon* is more of a different language from the current English than it really is; but, on the other hand, it indicates the connection between the two. It also gives us the first undoubted instance of a Non-*West-Saxon* composition (the *Ormulum*) interfering with the predominance of the *West-Saxon*. The period itself, too, is a convenient one. It is separated from the concluding

part of the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle by the whole reign of Henry II. ; and it contains, at least, three works of bulk and importance with well-marked transitional characters.

There is another period, also, which is certainly more natural than either the *Old* or the *Middle English* : the reign of the three Henrys ; or the interval between the brilliant reign of Edward III. and the Invention of Printing. It coincides with a marked decline of English, and a rapid culmination of the Scotch. It begins with the deaths of Chaucer and Gower ; the latter of whom is the last writer who composed a work of any magnitude in French. It coincides with a decided preponderance of Northumbrian and Mercian compositions over West-Saxon.

§ 48. The English as a member of a family of languages is only one of a large group.

Of the allied forms of speech on the Continent, the *Old Saxon* of Westphalia is the nearest. Only, however, so far as it is known ; and this is but imperfectly. The Old Saxon should be compared with the English in its West-Saxon form.

Next to this comes the *Frisian*. This we know in three stages—the Old, the Middle, and the New. It is only the Old Frisian and the Old English that need be compared. Any one who can read the English of the times before the Norman Conquest can read the Old Frisian. It is more like the *Northumbrian* English than the West-Saxon. Where it differs from the West-Saxon, it, in many points, agrees with the Norse or Scandinavian. This is what we expect from its geographical position.

The *Norse* or *Scandinavian* includes the literary languages of Denmark and Sweden, with their several dialects. It is best represented in its oldest form by the Icelandic. The Feroic of the Farö Isles belongs to this class. The affinities between the Norse and the Frisian, and of both with the Northumbrian of Great Britain, have introduced many complicated questions in the history of the English in general ; especially in reference to the Northern dialects.

§ 49. The Old Saxon area is bounded by the Frisian and Danish on the North and West, and by the *High German* on the South and East.

This means that the Old Saxon is *Low German*. It lies nearest to the *Dutch* of the Netherlands, and to the *Platt-Deutsch* dialects of Northern Germany.

The present literary language of Germany, or the *High German*, is less closely allied to the English than the *Platt-Deutsch* forms of speech.

All these forms of speech are divided into stages; and it is in their oldest stages that they are most advantageously compared with the English in *its* oldest stage—*Northumbrian* or *West-Saxon*, as the case may be.

§ 50. The Norse differs from the languages of Germany Proper and England by having a Passive Voice, and what is called a *Post-positive Article*. Thus:—*a. En Sol* is a sun. *Sol-en*—the sun. *Et Bord* is a table. *Bord-et*—the table.

This is not a mere *transposition* of the same Article. The Indefinite *en* is the Numeral; *et* is its Neuter form. The Definite Danish *en* is the English *he*; *et* is the English *it* (*hit*), i.e. the Masculine and Neuter forms of the Demonstrative Pronoun.

b. Jeg kalle=*I call*. *Jeg kalle-s*=*I am called*;—as *voco* and *vocor* in Latin. The final *s* is the Reflective Pronoun *sibi*, abbreviated and incorporated.

§ 51. *The Mæsogothic*.—There is another branch of the German family which, notwithstanding the opinion that it is to be classed as *Low German*, I prefer to place in a class by itself. Of its importance there can be no doubt.

It is the oldest of all the German forms of speech: for it was written as early as the last quarter of the 4th century. This applies to the mere date of the earliest specimens of it.

It is equally the oldest if we look to its structure.

But it is known in one stage only. It begins with the

Fourth Century, and by the end of the Seventh every vestige of it has disappeared. There is no dialect throughout the whole of Germany of which we can say, 'This is a modern, or middle form of the Gothic;' for so the language under notice is named—Gothic or Mœsogothic.

Moreover it has never been definitely and unanimously traced to the soil of Germany. It is German, but in what part of Germany it originated no one knows. At least there is no unanimity of opinion.

Nevertheless, it is the representative of the German Language in its oldest form, and there is no language in the German family which can be explained in some of its important details in the way of Inflection without a reference to it.

Such is a sketch of its general character, and such the reasons for giving it what at first may appear an undue prominence.

What we know of its external history is as follows :—

At the beginning of the Third century a German population was known on the northern side of the Lower Danube, in what was then called the Province of Dacia; now the Danubian Principalities, or Wallachia, Moldavia, and Bessarabia. The Goths became formidable to the Romans. They crossed the Danube, and invaded the north-eastern provinces of the Empire. They defeated the Emperor Decius in a great battle. They ravaged the coasts of Greece and Asia Minor. They continued formidable; and the Province of Dacia, to the North of the Danube, was surrendered by the Emperor Aurelian to the so-called Barbarians. Here the Goths establish a Kingdom; and we know, in respect to its geography, that the valley of the river Dniester belonged to it:—that it was probably the central part of it. They break up into two divisions—each with three names. They were called Ostrogoths or Visigoths from their geographical positions; Amalungs or Baltungs from the name of the *royal dynasty*; and Grutungs or Thervings from the names

by which they seem to have designated themselves. However, collectively, they are called, by the Romans, Goths.

In the last quarter of the fourth century they cross the Danube; nominally by permission of the Romans, but actually as a nation of warriors going forth to conquer. By A.D. 412 they have sacked Rome under Alaric; and initiated one Kingdom in France, and another in Spain. This division is that of the *Visigoths*.

In the latter half of the century the Ostrogoths, under *Theodoric*, make themselves masters of Italy.

But, though conquerors in three countries, they lose their language in all. It is smothered (so to say) by the Latin of the three conquered countries.

They are never heard of, from first to last, in Germany.

By the end of the Fourth Century these Goths were converted to Christianity—the Christianity of the Greek Church and of the Arian heresy.

This conversion was accompanied by a translation of the Scriptures: the Alphabet being founded on the *Greek*.

Of the translation, dating from the last quarter of the Fourth Century, we have remains, viz., the greater part of the Four Gospels.

The particular division of these Goths who seem by their conversion to have been transformed from warriors into peaceful villagers, settled in a district near Philippopolis in the Roman Province of *Mœsia*. The translation of their Scriptures is attributed to their Bishop, Ulphilas.

Hence, *Mæsogothic*, or the language of their *Ulphiline Gospels*, is the ordinary name for the chief fragment (the most important, though not the only one) of the language of these great Gothic conquerors.

§ 52. Its exact place in the classification of the German forms of speech is of less importance than the structure of their language.

1. It has a sign for the Nominative case; like the Greek and Latin. The Old High German and the Ice-

landic have the same. But it is wanting elsewhere. However, in both the High German and the Icelandic the sign is *-r*. In Moesogothic it is the older form *-s*.

2. It has a reduplicate Perfect Tense also, like the Latin and Greek.

3. It has a Passive Voice. So have the Scandinavian languages. But this (as aforesaid) is really a Middle, which was originally a Reflective.

§ 53. The German Class, although so large and comprehensive, is itself but a single member of a large Class, Group, Family, or Order: the oldest name for which was Indo-Germanic; the next in order Indo-European; the newest Aryan.

Of this group there are, at least, five divisions besides the German which are referred to, as a matter of course, in all works upon any German language; and, *vice versa*, works upon the Slavonic, Lithuanic, Latin, Greek, or Sanskrit refer to the German. These members of the Indo-European Class not only mutually illustrate each other, but are so frequently used in illustration that even in so special a work as the present they must be noticed. About the exact dimensions, however, of the class nothing will be said. There are certain points connected with it upon which there is no absolute unanimity of opinion. Upon the place of the six groups under notice there is no doubt whatever.

§ 54. *The Slavonic*.—The Slavonic division is represented by the Russian and the Polish, as the languages of which the general reader hears most. But the *native* language of Bohemia, the *Czech* (pronounced *Tsheckh*), as it is called in opposition to the Germans, is one that has, of late years, greatly risen in both political and literary importance. Then comes the *Servian*, from which, notwithstanding the close geographical contact, we must separate the *Bulgarian*, which is a very well marked form of speech. Like the Russian and the Servian, it is written in an alphabet of Greek origin. To the languages of this division belongs the *Old Slavonic*,

or the language in which the first translation of the Scriptures was made. The Servian language is one that is not so definitely divided from the Russian on one side, and the Slavonic dialects of the Austrian Empire, as the other languages of the family are from each other; and when we trace the Servian of the Eastern Church westwards, we find that the division is political rather than philological. The alphabet, however, of the Austrian Slavonic is of Roman, as opposed to Greek, origin. The Austrian provinces here under notice are Istria, Dalmatia, Carniola, and Carinthia. In the two latter the people call themselves *Slovenzi* (or *Slovenians*), and this word may be used for the whole group, though from its resemblance to *Slavonic* it is not a convenient one. These Slovenians to the south of the Baltic must not be confounded with the *Slovaks* and *Ruthenians* of Upper Hungary and Galicia. The *Slovak* is a form of the *Tshekh* (Bohemian) of Moravia; the *Ruthenian* is Russian.

Besides these languages there are two others which, like the Cornish of Cornwall in the last century, are mere fragments of an older language; which in the ninth century was spoken over the whole of the districts to which they belong. The first is the *Sorb*, or *Sorabian*, of Lusatia and part of Brandenburg, falling into two dialects. The second is the *Kassubic*, spoken in a few villages of the eastern part of Pomerania. This is wholly separated from the great area of the rest of the family.

Lastly, there was spoken in the last century, in the parts about Kostrow, Lüchow, and Danneberg, a fragment of the old Slavonic of the Duchy of Lunenburg.

§ 55. *The Lithuanic Language*.—This class falls into divisions: (1) the Lithuanic, and (2) the Let.

(1.) In the fifteenth century the Lithuanic language extended as far westwards as the Vistula, so that *East Prussia*, at least, was Lithuanic. Of the Lithuanic of *East Prussia*, or the *old Prussian*, we have only a Catechism, the Lord's Prayer, and Creed, dating from the time of the

Reformation. The great centre of the Lithuanic language at present is Samogitia, or the Russian Government of Kovno. The next great Lithuanic occupancy is the north-eastern part of East Prussia, the parts about Insterburg, Gumbinnen, and Tilsit. There are also fragments of the language in the governments of Vilna, Vitepsk, Polotsk, and Grodno.

(2.) Courland, Livonia, and parts of Estonia are the Let districts.

§ 56. *The Latin Family*.—Important as is the Latin in itself, it is still more so in its descendants; for the Latin is the mother-tongue of the following forms of speech.

The *Italian*; of which some of the dialects are *philologically* languages, e.g., the Sardinian, and more than one of the Piedmontese dialects.

Of the *Languages of the Spanish Peninsula* the chief are the Spanish and the Portuguese; but between these as *languages*, the difference is political rather than philological. Meanwhile the form of speech in Catalonia and Valencia is provincial rather than either Spanish Proper, or Castilian, or Portuguese.

The French.—Politically this includes all the so-called dialects of France; but the Provençal of the south is, philologically, a different language from the true French of the north.

The *Rumanyo*.—This is the language of the Danubian provinces (Wallachia and Moldavia), Bessarabia, and parts of Transylvania and Buckovina, *i.e.*, the old Roman province of Dacia.

The *Romance*, Rumonsch, of the Grison districts in Switzerland.

§ 57. *The Greek*.—Upon this it is not necessary to enlarge. In its modern form it is called the *Romaic*.

§ 58. *The Sanskrit*.—This is the literary and religious language of *Brahminical* India: the literary and religious language of the *Buddhists* of Ceylon, Burma, Siam, Pegu,

Cambojia, and Tibet being the *Pali*, a closely allied form of speech. The *Zend*, or language of the Zendavesta, the great canonical book of the old Persian creed, is another member of this group. From the antiquity of its structure, and from the richness of its literature, a very high value is put upon the Sanskrit. Its form, or stage, is that of a language of great antiquity, and so is that of the Pali and Zend. Upon the extent to which this class illustrates the change from an older stage to a newer, there has of late risen a difference of opinion; and it is clear that the matter is an important one. Is the Sanskrit a language like the Latin, the Greek, or the English, which we can trace through a long series of periods and point to certain recent forms of speech as its lineal descendants, or is it a language, like the Mæso-gothic, that ends in the same condition as it begins, with no lineal descendants, or no languages that stand to it in the same relation as the English to the Anglo-Saxon, or the Italian to the Latin? Are the existing languages of Northern India derivatives of the Sanskrit, like the French from the Latin, or are they languages of a different origin into which an inordinate amount of Sanskrit elements has been introduced? The older opinion, and the opinion at present of a decided majority, is in favour of the former of these views; that of a recent and comparatively small minority is in favour of the second. In the present work it is sufficient to speak of this very important class as constituted by the '*Sanskrit and its derived languages, whatever they may be.*'

§ 59. Something has been said about the original languages of Britain as opposed to the alien language introduced from Germany; and more would have been said if the work were a larger one. Something, too, has been said about the language of the Roman conquerors who held the island for upwards of four hundred years. With both these the Germans, or English, came in contact. What came of this contact? What was the action and re-action between the languages thus brought side by side? Was it

much or little? Was it attended with intermixture of blood? If so, to what extent? It is well known that on this point there are extreme opinions, and that some of them run far beyond the domain of philology. Are we a mixed race? Were we conquered wholly, or only half denationalized? Does our language help us in the investigation? If it do, what does it tell us? This is a question with which the present work has, fortunately, little to do. Upon the character, however, of the language which resulted, either through or in spite of the contact, there is but one opinion. The English is not an equivocal or ambiguous language; it is not Keltic and German mixed in such proportions as to make its character indefinite. It is, in this respect, scarcely a mixed language at all. Nothing short of the minutest philology can trace any Keltic element in it. It contains much that is not German. But this is not Keltic; and neither the other extraneous elements nor the Keltic besides can make the speech of England other than English—and English means German.

PART II.

ORTHOËPY AND ORTHOGRAPHY.

§ 60. In *speaking*, we represent our ideas and thoughts by means of *words*; which words are composed of certain elementary *sounds*. In the word *go* there are two such; in the word *got*, three; and so on. As long as we limit ourselves to speaking, these elementary sounds are all that require notice. They address themselves to the *ear*.

They are capable, however, of being represented by certain signs called *letters*; by which we are enabled not only to speak, but to *write*. Letters address themselves to the *eye*. In the word *go* the letter *g* is the sign of its first, the letter *o* the sign of its second, sound.

Orthoëpy signifies the right *utterance* of words. It deals with language as it is *spoken*, and determines how a word is to be *pronounced*. *Orthography* signifies the right use of *letters*. It deals with language as it is *written*, and determines how words should be *spelt*.

All languages were spoken long before they were written; and, at the present moment, there are numerous forms of speech which have never been reduced to writing at all. Hence, letters come later than the sounds they express, and orthography is subordinate to orthoëpy.

But as a picture never exactly represents the object from which it is taken, so the orthography of a language never exactly represents the orthoëpy; in other words, there is always some difference between language as it is spoken and language as it is written. Sometimes there are more

sounds than letters. Sometimes words change their pronunciation as they pass from one people or from one generation to another; whilst no corresponding change is made in the manner of writing them. Sometimes fresh sounds from other languages are introduced; and, as no fresh letters are brought to represent them, they must be represented, as they best may, by the letters already in use.

§ 61. The elementary sounds in the English language as at present spoken are as follows:—

Vowels.—**A.**—1. The sound of the letter *a* in *ah*, *father*, &c.

2. The sound of the letter *a* in *fate*, *bate*, *ale*, *pale*, *bait*, *ail*, *snake*, *snail*, &c.

3. The sound of the letter *a* in *fat*, *pat*, *bat*, *that*, *hat*, *patting*, &c.

E.—4. The sound of the *e* in *bed*, *beck*, *less*, *net*, *netting*, &c.—This is a short quick sound. It is expressed by the letter *e*.

I.—5. The sound of the *e* in *feet*, *need*, *seed*, *seek*, *leak*, *seat*, *beat*, &c.—This sound is often considered as allied to the preceding one and as a long variety of it. It is, however, the long form of the vowel sound next about to be mentioned; namely,

6. The sound of the *i* in *tin*, *pity*, *pitted*, *stick*, *kick*, &c.—This sound is often considered as allied to the sound of *i* in *pine*, *shine*, &c., and as a shortened variety of it. It is, however, a shortened form of the sound of *e* in *feet*.

U.—7. The sound of the *oo* in *cool*, and of the *o* in *move*, *prove*.

8. The sound of the *u* in *bull*, *full*, *pull*, &c.—Although these two last-mentioned sounds are expressed in spelling by different letters, they are evidently allied in utterance. They are both varieties of one and the same sound, pronounced rapidly in the one case, and slowly in the other. The two sounds bear the same relation to each other as the *a* in *fate* bears to the *a* in *fat*, and the *ee* in *feet* to the *i* in *fit*.

O.—9. The sound of the *aw* in *bawl*, of the *au* in *haul*, and of the *a* in *hall*, *all*, *talk*, &c.—This sound is generally expressed by the letter *a*, either alone, as in *all* and *ball*, or combined with some other letter, as in *haul* and *bawl*. The expression, however, is faulty, and conceals the true nature of the sound. Its real relation is to the two sounds that will next be mentioned, to which it stands in the same relation that the *a* in *father* does to the *a* in *fate* and the *a* in *fat*.

10. The sound of the *o* in *note*, *boat*, *float*, *no*, *so*, &c.

11. The sound of the *o* in *not*, *knot*, *knotty*, &c.

12. The sound of the *u* in *but*, *nut*, &c.

Semi-Vowels.—13. The sound of the letter *w* in *wo*, *will*.—This sound is evidently allied to the sound of the *oo* in *cool*. Some writers consider it identical, and assert that the words *will* and *oo-il* are sounded alike. It is, however, convenient to consider the *w* in *will* as a separate independent sound.

14. The sound of the letter *y* in *ye*, *yes*, *yet*.—This sound is evidently allied to the sound of the *ee* in *feet*. Some writers consider it identical, and assert that the words *yet* and *ee-et* are sounded alike. It is, however, convenient to consider the *y* in *yet* as a separate independent sound. The sounds expressed by *w* and *y* are called *semi-vowel* (i.e. *half-vowel*) sounds, or *semi-vowels*.

Mutes.—P, B, F, V.—15. The sound of the letter *p* in *pin*, *pit*, &c.

16. The sound of the letter *b* in *bin*, *bit*, &c.

17. The sound of the letter *f* in *fin*, *fit*, &c.

18. The sound of the letter *v* in *van*, *vane*, &c.

T, D, TH, DH.—19. The sound of the letter *t* in *tin*, *tip*, *teal*, *neat*, &c.

20. The sound of the letter *d* in *din*, *dip*, *deal*, *need*, &c.

21. The sound of the letters *th* in *thin*, *thick*, *through*, *cloth*, *moth*, &c.—It is here necessary to mark the difference that exists between the speaking and the spelling. The

sound of the *th* in *thin* is a simple single elementary sound, and, as such, should be expressed by a simple single elementary letter. Instead of this, it is expressed by two letters, or by a combination; so that, although a simple sound to the ear, it has the appearance of being a compound one to the eye.

22. The sound of the letters *th* in *thine*, *them*, *than*, *clothe*.—Respecting this sound the reader's attention is called to two points:

1st. That like the sound last mentioned, it is a simple single elementary sound, expressed, not by a simple single elementary sign, or letter, but by two letters, or a combination.

2nd. That, although different from the sound last mentioned, it is spelt precisely in the same way.

The *th* in *thin* is allied to the sound of *t*, as in *tin*.

The *th* in *thine* is allied to the sound of *d*, as in *din*.

K, G.—23. The sound of the letter *k*, as in *kill*, *keep*, *oak*, &c.

24. The sound of the letter *g*, as in *go*, *gun*, *log*, *egg*, &c.

25. The sound of the letter *s*, as in *sin*, *seal*, *yes*, &c.

26. The sound of the letter *z*, as in *zeal*, *buzz*, *blaze*, &c.

27. The sound of the letters *sh*, as in *shy*, *shine*, *short*, *ash*, *bush*, &c.

28. The sounds of the letter *z* in *azure*, *z* in *glazier*, and the *s* in *pleasure* are identical.

NG.—29. The sound of the letters *ng*, as in *king*, *sing*, *ring*, &c.

H.—30. The sound of the letter *h*, as in *hot*, *hear*, *hop*, &c., consists of a simple breathing.

Liquids.—31. The sound of the letter *l* in *leg*, *kill*, &c.

32. The sound of the letter *m* in *mat*, *cram*, &c.

33. The sound of the letter *n* in *net*, *none*, &c.

34. The sound of the letter *r* in *row*, *bear*, &c.

Here ends the list of the *simple* single elementary sounds in the English language.

Compound Sounds.—Of these, there are six ; four are compounded by means of a vowel, and two by means of a consonant.

The compound sounds formed by vowels fall into two divisions.

Compounds formed by means of a vowel and the semi-vowel *w*.—These are two in number :

1. The sound of the letters *ou* in *house*, *mouse*, &c.—The nature of this compound is disguised by the spelling. It consists of the sound of the *a* in *father*, followed by that of the *w* in *will*, rapidly pronounced.

2. The sound of the letters *ew* in *new*. The nature of this compound is disguised by the spelling. It consists of the sound of the *i* in *pit*, followed by that of the *w* in *will*, rapidly pronounced.

Compounds formed by means of a vowel and the semi-vowel *y*.—These, also, are two in number :

1. The sound of the letter *i* in *pine*, *fine*, *find*, *mind*.—The nature of this compound is disguised by the spelling ; since it is represented by means of the single letter *i*. The real elements of the sound in question are generally considered to be the sound of the *a* in *fat*, followed by that of the *y* in *yet*, rapidly pronounced.

2. The sound of the letters *oi* in *voice*, *noise*.—The nature of this compound is sufficiently, although not exactly, represented by the spelling. Its real elements are the *aw* in *bawl*, and the *y* in *yet*.

The compound sounds formed by the union of a vowel and a semi-vowel are called diphthongs.

The compound sounds formed by the union of two consonants are two in number :

1. The sound of the letters *ch* in *chest*.—This is really the sound of *tsh* rapidly pronounced.

2. The sound of the letter *j* in *jest*.—This is really the sound of *dzh* rapidly pronounced. The letter *g*, as in *gibbet*, also represents this sound.

§ 62. When the passage of the air is either free, or only partially closed, the stream of air passes without interruption, and so forms the sound which we call the *vowels*. The vowels can all be pronounced with the mouth partially open and with the breath in an uninterrupted stream.

The elementary sounds called *consonants* have the following peculiarity. They are unable to form even the shortest word or syllable without the aid of a vowel. Thus, the vowels *a* or *o* are capable of being used as syllables, and so are the combinations *ba* or *lo*. But the single sounds of *b'*, or *l'*, if taken by themselves, cannot form a word, or even a syllable.

In order to understand this difference, it is necessary to take some mute consonants and to pronounce them as independently of any vowel as it is possible to do. We must try to give a sound to such single consonants as *p'*, *t'*, &c. In attempting this, we shall succeed in making an imperfect sound.

Now, if the mute consonant so taken and uttered be one of the following, *p*, *f*, *t*, *th* (as in *thin*), *k*, *s*, or *sh*, the sound will be that of a *whisper*. The sound of *p'*, *t'* is that of a man speaking *under* the natural pitch of his voice.

But if the mute consonant so taken and uttered be *b*, *v*, *d*, *th* (as in *thine*), *g*, *z*, or *zh*, the sound will be that of a man speaking at the *natural pitch of his voice*.

§ 63. Those that are sounded like *p'* and *f'*, &c., are called the *Surd* mutes.

Those that are sounded like *b'* and *v'*, &c., are called the *Sonant* mutes.

Surd.				Sonant.			
p . . f	k . . —	b . . v	g ² . . —				
t . . th ¹	s . . sh	d . . th ³	z . . z ⁴				

Rule.—When two mutes of different degrees of sonancy come together in the same syllable, they form a sound that is incapable of being pronounced.

¹ As in *thin*.

² As in *gun*.

³ As in *thine*.

⁴ As in *azure*.

This rule may be verified by practising a few combinations according to the arrangement of the preceding table; wherein it may be observed that the surd mutes are arranged on the left, the sonant mutes on the right hand. Having clearly recognized the distinction between the two, let us proceed.

Surd.				Sonant.			
p	.	f	—	b	.	v	—
t	.	th ¹	—	d	.	th ²	—
		s	sh			g ²	z ⁴

Taking whatever letter we may from the one side of the double line, and joining it immediately, in the same syllable, with any letter whatever from the other side of the double line, we find the combination unpronounceable.

<i>aba,</i>	<i>avt,</i>	<i>abth,</i>	<i>avth.</i>
<i>agt,</i>	<i>agp,</i>	<i>agf,</i>	<i>ags.</i>
<i>apd,</i>	<i>afb,</i>	<i>apv,</i>	<i>afd.</i>
<i>atb,</i>	<i>akd,</i>	<i>akz,</i>	<i>akb.</i>
<i>asd,</i>	<i>ashd,</i>	<i>asg,</i>	<i>ashg, &c.</i>

Of course, combinations of this sort can be *written*, and they can be *spelt*; they cannot, however, be pronounced, each sound remaining unchanged.

In order to become *pronounced*, a change must occur; one of the sounds must change its character, and so accommodate itself to the other. This change takes place in one of two ways; either the first of the two sounds takes the degree of the second, or else the second takes the degree of the first. Thus, *abt* becomes pronounceable either by *b* becoming *p*, or by *t* passing into *d*; in other words, it changes either into *apt* or into *abd*. So on with the rest.

<i>av</i> becomes either <i>aft</i> , or <i>avd</i> .	<i>apd</i> becomes either <i>apt</i> , or <i>abd</i> .
<i>abth</i> " " <i>apth</i> , " <i>abdh</i> .	<i>asd</i> " " <i>ast</i> , " <i>azd</i> .
<i>agt</i> " " <i>akt</i> , " <i>agd</i> .	<i>ashd</i> " " <i>asht</i> , " <i>azhd</i> .
<i>ags</i> " " <i>aks</i> , " <i>agz</i> .	<i>asg</i> " " <i>ask</i> , " <i>azg</i> .

This change is necessary and universal. It holds good not for the English alone, but for all languages. The only

¹ As in *thin*.

² As in *gun*.

³ As in *thine*.

⁴ As in *azure*.

difference is, that different languages change different letters; that is, one language accommodates the first letter to the second, and so turns *agt* into *akt*; whilst another accommodates the second letter to the first, changing *agt* into *agd*.

§ 64. There is no fact that requires to be more familiarly known than this; since there are, at least, three formations in the English language where its influence is most important. These are the Possessive forms in *-s*, the Plurals in *-s*, the Preterites in *-d* and *-t*.

The *s* in the word *stags* is surd; the *g* in the word *stags* is sonant. Notwithstanding this, the combination *ags* exists. It exists, however, in the *spelling* only. In *speaking*, the *s* is sounded as *z*, and the word *stags* is pronounced *stagz*. Again, in words like *tossed*, *plucked*, *looked*, the *e* is omitted in pronunciation. Hence the words become *tossd*, *pluckd*, *lookd*, &c. But this combination exists in the *spelling* only; since the preterites of *pluck*, *look*, and *toss*, are, in *speech*, pronounced *pluckt*, *lookt*, *tosst*.

§ 65. Next to knowing that two mutes of different degrees of sonancy cannot come together in the same syllable, it is important to know that two identical sounds cannot come together in the same syllable.

In illustration of this, we may take a word ending in *p*, *t*, or *s*, such as *tap*, *bat*, or *mis*. To add a second *p*, a second *t*, or a second *s*, is impracticable. At the first glance this statement seems untrue. Nothing, apparently, is commoner than words like *tapp*, *batt*, *miss*. However, like the combinations indicated above, these are, in reality, combinations in *spelling* only; they have no existence in pronunciation. We have only to attempt to pronounce *bat't*, *sap'p*, &c. to prove this.

§ 66. To express these twenty-eight sounds in writing, there are, in English, the following twenty-six letters: *a e i o u y p b f v t d k g s z h l m n r j c q x*. It is, therefore, easy to see that there are in English more sounds to be expressed in writing than there are letters to express them by.

From these twenty-six letters, however, we must subtract the following—

1. The letter *j*, as in *jest*; since it is not one of the twenty-eight *simple* elementary sounds that this letter is the sign of. The subtraction of the letter *j* reduces the number of letters expressive of the *simple* sounds to twenty-five:

2. The letter *c*; since it expresses only what is as well expressed by either *s* or *k*. The words *city* and *can* are pronounced *sity* and *kan* respectively. The subtraction of the letter *c* reduces the number of letters expressive of the *simple* sounds to twenty-four:

3, 4. The letters *q*, and *x*; since *q* is only *kw*, and *x* is only *ks*. The words *queen* and *box* are pronounced *kween*, and *boks*, respectively. The subtraction of the letters *q* and *x* reduces the number of letters to twenty-two.

We have now seen that for* twenty-eight *simple* elementary sounds there are only twenty-two *simple* elementary letters; consequently, six of the *simple* elementary sounds have no sign or letter corresponding to them. These are,

1. The *u* in *but*.
- 2, 3. The *th* in (a) *thin*; in (b) *thine*.
4. The sound of the *sh* in *shine*.
5. The sound of the *z* in *azure*.
6. The sound of the *ng* in *king*.

§ 67. The English Alphabet is,

1. *Redundant*. It contains three superfluous letters, viz. *c*, *q*, and *x*.

2. *Deficient*. It wants signs for the six sounds mentioned in § 66.

3. *Inconsistent*. It expresses the double sound of the first letter in *jest* (*dzh*) by a single sign, and the single

* See § 68. Here the list gives *forty* sounds: eleven of the vowels, however, are reducible to modifications of *a*, *e*, *i*, *o*, and *u*; whilst the last six sounds are *Diphthongs*.

sounds of the first letters in *thin*, *thine*, and *shine*, by two signs (*th* and *sh*).

There are other faults in the English Alphabet and the English method of spelling, which it is not necessary here to enlarge upon. For many of these a sufficient, though not satisfactory, reason can be exhibited.

§ 68.

RECAPITULATION.

<i>Vowels.</i>	1.	The sound of the letter	<i>a</i>	in	<i>father.</i>	
"	2.	" " "	<i>a</i>	"	<i>fate.</i>	
"	3.	" " "	<i>a</i>	"	<i>fat.</i>	
"	4.	" " "	<i>e</i>	"	<i>bed.</i>	
"	5.	" " "	<i>e</i>	"	<i>glebe.</i>	
"	6.	" " "	<i>i</i>	"	<i>pin.</i>	
"	7.	" " "	<i>o</i>	"	<i>prove.</i>	
"	8.	" " "	<i>u</i>	"	<i>full.</i>	
"	9.	" " letters	<i>aw</i>	"	<i>bawl.</i>	
"	10.	" " letter	<i>o</i>	"	<i>note.</i>	
"	11.	" " "	<i>o</i>	"	<i>not.</i>	
"	12.	" " "	<i>u</i>	"	<i>but.</i>	
<i>Semivowels.</i>	13.	" " "	<i>w</i>	"	<i>well.</i>	
"	14.	" " "	<i>y</i>	"	<i>yes.</i>	
<i>Mutes.</i>	15.	" " "	<i>p</i>	"	<i>pain.</i>	
"	16.	" " "	<i>b</i>	"	<i>bane.</i>	
"	17.	" " "	<i>f</i>	"	<i>fane.</i>	
"	18.	" " "	<i>v</i>	"	<i>vane.</i>	
"	19.	" " "	<i>t</i>	"	<i>tin.</i>	
"	20.	" " "	<i>d</i>	"	<i>din.</i>	
"	21.	" " letters	<i>th</i>	"	<i>thin.</i>	
"	22.	" " "	<i>th</i>	"	<i>thine.</i>	
"	23.	" " letter	<i>k</i>	"	<i>kill.</i>	
"	24.	" " "	<i>g</i>	"	<i>guns.</i>	
<i>Sibilants.</i>	25.	" " "	<i>s</i>	"	<i>scal.</i>	
"	26.	" " "	<i>z</i>	"	<i>zeal.</i>	
"	27.	" " letters	<i>sh</i>	"	<i>shine.</i>	
"	28.	" " letter	<i>z</i>	"	<i>azure.</i>	
<i>Nasal.</i>	29.	" " letters	<i>ng</i>	"	<i>king.</i>	
<i>Breathing.</i>	30.	" " letter	<i>h</i>	"	<i>hot.</i>	
<i>Liquids.</i>	31.	" " "	<i>l</i>	"	<i>low.</i>	
"	32.	" " "	<i>m</i>	"	<i>mow.</i>	
"	33.	" " "	<i>n</i>	"	<i>no.</i>	
"	34.	" " "	<i>r</i>	"	<i>row.</i>	

<i>Diphthongs.</i>	35.	The sound of the letters	<i>ou</i>	in	<i>house.</i>	}
"	36.	" "	"	<i>ew</i>	" <i>new.</i>	
"	37.	" "	letter	<i>i</i>	" <i>pine.</i>	
"	38.	" "	letters	<i>oi</i>	" <i>voice.</i>	
<i>Sibilants.</i>	39.	" "	"	<i>ch</i>	" <i>chest.</i>	}
"	40.	" "	letter	<i>j</i>	" <i>jest.</i>	

The last two sounds of this list are *Compound Sibilants*; inasmuch as they are made up out of those of *tsh* and *dzh* respectively. They are, in fact, *Consonantal Diphthongs*, though the term *Diphthong* is generally limited to *Vowel combinations*.

§ 69. *Accent.*—The following words are accented on the first syllable—*áncor, árgue, hústen, fátber, fózes, smítung, húsbánd, márkét, vápour, bárefoot, &c.*

In *brigáde, preténce, harpoón, relíeve, detér, assúme, besought, beréft, befóre, abroáð, abóde, abstrúse, &c.*, the accent is on the last.

I. Words where the unaccented syllables are to the accented syllables as one to one :

a. Accent on the first syllable,—*áncor, árgue, &c.*

b. Accent on the second syllable,—*harpoón, brigáde, &c.*

II. Words where the unaccented syllables are to the accented syllables as two to one :

a. Accent on the first syllable,—*fórtify, mérrily, cheérily, pitiful, déstitute.*

b. Accent on the second syllable,—*disáble, endeúvour, repúlsive, replénish.*

c. Accent on the third syllable,—*cavaliér, disembógue.*

d. Words with their accent on the fourth syllable from the end are rare; because, quadrisyllables have generally two accents, as *Eúropéan*; or one on the third syllable from the end, as *inquisitive*. Still, there are a few words, like *órtodoxy, &c.*, where the accentuation is *órtodoxy*, and not *órtodóxy*. Three, however, as a general rule, is the greatest number of syllables for which a single accent is sufficient.

§ 70. Words like *harpoón* and *cavaliér*, where the accent

is on the last syllable, are comparatively rare in English. This is because the ordinary place of the accent is on the most fundamental syllable of the word to which it belongs; secondary additions, whether affixes, like the *-ly* in *mánly*, the *-ness* in *neúrness*, &c., or prefixes, like the *be-* in *bespéak*, the *with-* in *withóut*, &c., being unaccented.

As affixes, or additions to the end of a word, are commoner in English than prefixes, or additions at the beginning of one, the tendency of our grammar is to throw the accent *back*, i.e. towards the beginning of words of more than one syllable, rather than towards their end.

§ 71. The same was the case in Latin; where, as most words ended in an inflectional, or some similar superadded syllable, the accent was thrown back. In the Latin, however, before it became French, many of these unaccented syllables dropped off; and words like *civil-is*, *natióon-is*, and many others, became *civile*, *natióon*, and the like. The French, then, abounds in words whereof the last syllable is accented; and, hence, it will be found that most of the words like *cavaliér*, *brigáde*, and the like—words with their accent on the last syllable—are of French origin.

The derivatives of the word *týrant* well illustrate the conflict between the claims of the most fundamental part of the word to keep the accent, and the difficulty of throwing it as far back as the fourth syllable from the end: (1) *týrant*; (2) *týranny*, not *tyrúnny*; (3) *tyrúnical*; (4) *tyrúnically*. Nevertheless, we say *tyrúnic*, not *týrannic*; probably on the precedent of *tyrúnical*. Here we have as many as *three* manifestly superadded syllables.

§ 72. Certain words, in other respects identical, are Nouns when the accent is on the *first*, Verbs when it is on the last, syllable—e.g., *an ábsent man* as opposed to *I ábsént myself*; *aúgment*, *augmént*; *cómpound*, *compoúnd*; *súrvey*, *survéy*; *tórment*, *tormént*; &c., &c.

PART III.

ETYMOLOGY.

§ 73. *Etymology of two kinds.*—There are two kinds of Etymology.

(1.) One treats of such connections as that between words like *pater* and *father*; *patres* and *fathers*. These belong to different languages, and are not derived from one another. The *-s* in both is the sign of the same case; and the radical parts of the two are the same. But their history is that of two *concurrent* forms; and the common origin must be sought in some older form of speech. This is Comparative Etymology.

(2.) The other treats of such connections as *patres* and *pater*; *fathers* and *father*. Here one of the two words is derived from the other, and both forms belong to the same language. This is Grammatical Etymology; with which the present treatise will have the most to do.

Etymology deals with *single* words and the various forms they may take. It is, in doing this, opposed to *Syntax*, which treats of two or more words in combination.

§ 74. But, as two words are often combined into one, we have a department of grammar intermediate to the two divisions. This is called Composition. It is sometimes difficult to say where the combination of two separate words ends, and the fusion of the two into one begins. Composition, however, is generally and properly considered to belong to Etymology.

Composition takes place when two separate words are joined together so as to form a single word, as

day-light	dog-star	English-man
nut-brown	father-like	pea-cock.

§ 75. *Derivation* takes place when a word is either changed by the addition of some new elementary sound, or by the alteration of one previously existing.

hunt- <i>er</i>	drunk- <i>ard</i>	he-spoke
wood- <i>en</i>	spin- <i>ster</i>	chick- <i>en</i> .

Composition implies the addition of *whole words*; *Derivation*, the addition of *parts of whole words*, either real or possible.

§ 76. Certain Derivatives are called *Inflections*. These present themselves in nouns and verbs only. They are the forms by which we determine gender, number, case, voice, mood, tense, and person, and will be considered in detail in the sequel.

The Inflection of a noun is called its *Declension*. Nouns are *declined*.

The Inflection of a verb is called its *Conjugation*. Verbs are *conjugated*.

§ 77. *Transitional forms*.—All these divisions run into one another; though not to an extent which should embarrass us if a few preliminary notices are borne in mind.

Grammatical combinations may be made in such a manner that it is difficult to determine whether two separate words are in contact with one another, and combined by the rules of Syntax, or in a state of Composition. Thus in *all black birds* are not *blackbirds*, what is *blackbird*? Is it a pair of separate words or two words combined into one? Again in *Thursday*, is the combination one like *man's hat* in which the *-s* is the sign of a genitive case, and the case is one of Syntax; or is *s* a mere connected link by which the two elements of a compound are united? It may be either. In questions of this kind it is the *accent* helps us. In the

ordinary syntactic combination each word keeps its own accent, as *bláck bîrd*. In composition one gives way to the other—*bláckbird*, *Thúrsday*.

Composition often simulates derivation when, after the union of two distinctly separate words, one of them either changes its form or becomes obsolete. Thus *manly* looks more like a derivative than a compound. But it is only a shortened form of *manlike*. Again, the *ric* in *bishop-ric* is no longer current as an ordinary term in English. Yet, when it was first attached to the word *bishop*, it was as truly a separate word as *kingdom*, *domain*, or *jurisdiction*, or any other substantive.

With instances like those just given the process of reducing derivation to composition is an easy matter. All that is required is a certain amount of knowledge of the language in its earlier stages. This is wanted for *bishopric*. But in the word *manly* less than this will be enough. We have only to *consider* a little, and its connection with *manlike* strikes us at once. The words *gentlemanly* and *gentlemanlike* are still more to the purpose. With a little knowledge, then, and a little consideration, we can do much—so long as the word is a *dissyllable*—for we can separate its component parts, even if we do no more. But *monosyllables* may also be, in respect to their origin, compounds. Here the analysis is more perplexing. Words like *not*, *such*, and *which* are not easily picked to pieces. Yet, common words as they are, and monosyllables as they are, they are *compounds*. *Not* is a compound of the negative element *n'*, and *whit* (as in *not a whit*). It is *n'* *aught*, which is again compounded of a prefix *â-*. *Which* is, in Scotch, *whilk*; in German, *welch*; and *such* is in Scotch *swilk*, and in German *solch*, where the *lk* (*lch*) is the word *like*. Here, we get derivation, as opposed to composition in its most characteristic form.

In Frisian the form is simpler still; the elements *so* and *like* being reduced to *sok*. From *thilk*=*the like*, found

both in Scotch and our provincial dialects, the *l* is similarly ejected, and *thec* in the local dialects of the South-western counties represents the compound.

COMPOSITION.

§ 78. Substantives preceded by Substantives.—*Day-star, land-slip, light-house, fir-tree, goose-grass, sea-man, collar-bone, earth-nut, fire-wood, moon-light.*

Substantives preceded by Adjectives.—*Blind-worm, free-man, half-penny, grey-beard, quick-silver, holy-day.*

Substantives preceded by Verbs.—*Turn-spit, dare-devil, turn-coat.*

Substantives preceded by the form in *-ing*.—*Turning-lathe, sawing-mill.*

Adjectives preceded by Substantives.—*Sin-ful, thank-ful, blood-red, eye-bright, coal-black, snow-white, nut-brown, heart-whole, ice-cold, foot-sore, &c.*

Adjectives preceded by Adjectives.—*All-mighty, two-fold, many-fold, &c.*

Adjectives preceded by Verbs.—*Stand-still, live-long.*

Verbs preceded by Verbs.—*Hear-say.* Rare.

Present Participles* preceded by Adjectives (with an adverbial power).—*All-seeing, all-ruling, soft-flowing, fast-sailing, merry-making.*

Past Participles preceded by Adjectives.—*New-born, free-spoken, fresh-made, new-made, new-laid.*

Present Participles preceded by Substantives.—*Fruit-bearing, music-making.*

Past Participles preceded by Substantives.—*Heaven-born, bed-ridden, blood-stained.*

Verbal Substantives preceded by Substantives.—*Man-eater, woman-eater, kid-napper, horn-blower.*

Verbal Adjectives preceded by Substantives.—*Mop-headed, chicken-hearted.*

* See §§ 140-144. These will explain a difficulty which is only indicated here, viz., the ambiguous import of the termination *-ing*.

Verbal Adjectives preceded by Adjectives.—*Cold-hearted, flaxen-haired, hot-headed, curly-pated.*

§ 79. Adverbs entering into composition are of two sorts:

1st. Those that can be separated from the word with which they combine, and, nevertheless, appear as independent words; as *over, under, well*, in *over-do, under-go, well-beloved, &c.*

2nd. Those that, when they are separated from the verb with which they combine, have no independent existence as separate words; *e.g.* the syllables *be-, un-, a-*, in *be-hove, be-fit, be-seem, be-lieve, be-lie, be-smatter, be-smear, be-get, be-labour, be-do, be-gin, be-gird, be-hold, be-mourn, be-reave, be-deck, be-think, be-mire, be-rhyme, un-bind, un-do, un-loose, un-lock, un-wind, a-light, a-rouse, a-rise, a-wake, a-wak-en, a-bet, a-bide.*

DERIVATION.

§ 80. Addition of a Vowel.—*Ba-by* from *babe*—*Dogg-ie, lass-ie, mous-ie, wif-ie.*

Addition of L.—*Gird-le—mick-le—spark-le.*

Addition of R.—(1) *Laugh-t-er, slaugh-t-er*; (2) *gand-er*; (3) *lay-er, fodd-er*; (4) *hunt-er, sinn-er.*

Verbs—*Hind-er, low-er.*

Addition of N.—Substantives.—*Maid-en, mai-n* (as in *might* and *main*). That the *-n* is no part of the original word in *mai-n*, we see from the word *may*. The idea in both *may* and *mai-n* is that of *power*.

Adjectives.—Words of this sort express the circumstance of the object to which they are applied, being *made of the material of which* the radical part of the derivative is the name: thus, *gold-en* is a derivative from *gold*, the material of which *golden guineas* are made. So, also, *oak-en, ash-en, beech-en, braz-en, flax-en, gold-en, lead-en, silk-en, wood-en, wooll-en, hemp-en, wheat-en, oat-en, wax-en.*

Addition of the sound of O, originating in *-ow* or *-ov*, and spelt in the present English *-ow*.—By comparison with

shade and *mead*, the forms *shad-ow* and *mead-ow* are shown to be derivative.

Addition of T.—1. Substantives.—*a.* Words which in A. S. ended in *-t*, *gif-t*, *shrif-t*, *thef-t*, *wef-t* (*weave*), *rif-t*, *drif-t*, *thrif-t*, *fros-t* (*freeze*), *gris-t* (*grind*), *fligh-t*, *sigh-t*, *draugh-t* (*draw*), *weigh-t*.

b. Words which in A. S. ended in *-ta*. The compounds of the word *wright* (from the root *work*, in the old past tense *wrought*); such as *cart-wrigh-t*, *wheel-wrigh-t*, *mill-wrigh-t*, &c.

2. Adjectives.—*Tigh-t* (*tie*).

Addition of D.—Substantives.—*Bran-d* (*burn*, *brenn*, obsolete), *floo-d* (*flow*), *mai-d* (*may* in Lowland Scotch), *see-d* (*sow*), *bur-d-en* (*bear*).

2. Adjectives.—*Col-d* (*cool*).

Addition of TH (A. S. *þ* as sounded in *thin*).—Substantives.—*Dea-th*, *bir-th* (*bear*), *heal-th*, *leng-th*, *bread-th*, *heigh-t*, *dep-th*, *mir-th*, *tru-th*, *weal-th*, *fil-th*, *til-th* (*tillage*, or *tilled ground*), *ki-th* (as in the phrase *kith and kin*).

2. Adjectives.—The syllable *-cou-th* in the compound word *uncou-th*. This word originally means *unknown*, originating in the word *ken*=to *know*.

Addition of TH (A. S. *ð*) as sounded in *thine*. *Bur-th-en*, derived from *bear*.

Addition of the sound of the Z in *zeal* and the S in *flag* (*flagz*).—Verbs.—*Cleanse* (*clenz*), from *clean*. In A. S. *clæn-s-ian*.

Addition of the sound of K.—*Hill-ock*.

Addition of the sound of the vowel E (as in *feet*), originating in *-ig*, and spelt in the present English *-y*.—All the derivative adjectives that now end in *-y*, ended in A. S. in *-ig*; as *blood-y*, *craft-y*, *dear-y*, *might-y*, *mist-y*, *mood-y*, *merr-y*, *worth-y*, of which the A. S. forms were *blód-ig*, *cræft-ig*, *dreór-ig*, *might-ig*, *mist-ig*, *mód-ig*, *myr-ig*, *worth-ig*.

Addition of *-en*, or *-in*.—*Vix-en* = *female fox*.

Addition of the syllable *-ing*.—*Farth-ing* ($\frac{1}{2}$), *rid-ing* *

* As the *Three Ridings* of *Yorkshire*.

($\frac{1}{2}$, a corruption from *thrith-ing*). Also, *cleans-ing*, *dawn-ing*, *morn-ing*. In these words the *-ing* was originally *-ung*; as *clæn-s-ung*, *dag-ung*, A. S.

Addition of the syllable *-ling*.—*Gos-Ling* (*little goose*), *duck-ling* (*little duck*), *dar-ling* (*little dear*), *hire-ling*, *found-ling*, *fond-ling*, *nest-ling*, &c. The words of this class are generally diminutives, or words expressive of smallness.

Addition of the syllable *-kin*.—*Lamb-kin* (*little lamb*), *man-i-kin* (*little man*). Words ending in *-kin* are chiefly diminutives.

Addition of the syllable *-rel*.—*Cock-erel* (*little cock*), *pick-erel* (*little pike*).

Addition of the syllable *-ard*.—*Drunk-ard*, *stink-ard*.

Addition of the syllable *-old*.—*Thresh-old*.

Addition of the syllable *-ern*.—*East-ern*, *west-ern*, *north-ern*, *south-ern*.

Addition of the syllable *-ish*.—*Child-ish*, *Eng-lish*, *self-ish*, *whit-ish*. The original form was *-isk*; *cild-isc* (*child-ish*), *Engl-isc* (*Engl-ish*), A. S.

Addition of the syllable *-ness*.—*Good-ness*, *bad-ness*, *wicked-ness*, *bright-ness*, *dark-ness*, *weari-ness*, *dreari-ness*, &c.

Change of the sound of a consonant.—*Price*, *prize*; *cloth*, *clothe* (pronounced *clodhe*); *use*, *use* (pronounced *uze*); *grass*, *graze*; *grease* (pronounced *greace*), *grease* (pronounced *greaze*). In each of the pairs of words given above, the former is a substantive, and the latter a verb.

Change of the sound of a vowel.—*Rise*, *raise*: *lie*, *lay*: *fall*, *fell*: *sit*, *set*. The generality of these words are verbs. There are, however, a few nouns; as *top*, *tip*; *cat*, *kit*.

Here the sense is generally that of a Diminutive.

§ 81. The termination *-ry* in words like *rookery*, *fishery*, &c., presents some difficulty. It is clear that the *-r* forms no part of the original word; for, though there is such a word as *fisher*, *fisherman*, there is no such word as *rooker*. Neither does *fishery* mean a collection of *fishermen*, but one of *fishes*. *Yeomanry* and *Jewry* are words of similar

origin and meaning. They carry with them the idea of a collection, or assemblage. The words *Engliskry*, *Danishry*, and *Welshery* are to be found in old authors. They are, however, at present obsolete. *Eyrie* is generally said to mean the nest of an eagle. It rather means a collection of eggs, or *eggery*; for such is the old form of the word.

What, however, is the *-r*? In the old Dutch and other allied dialects, we find a kind of plural in *-r*. Thus *cealfu*=*calves*; *lambru*=*lambs*; *eggru*=*eggs*. Indeed, in one word it occurs in provincial and archaic English, viz. *childer*=*children*. Out of this *-r*, with the addition of the sound of *-y*, has the termination *-ry* in the words above given originated.

In other words, however, this origin is inadmissible; and the idea of collection or assemblage is either obscure or non-existent. Such are *foolery*, *prudery*, *bravery*, *slavery*, *witchery*, *stitchery* (*needlework*), &c. In all these the *-ry* has originated out of a false analogy.

§ 82. Derivation by means of the addition of the syllable *-ster*.—*Song-ster*, *pun-ster*. Originally words in *-str* were limited to the names of females, and were opposed to the substantives in *-er*, the names of male agents. Thus, in A. S.,

sangere, a male singer	} were opposed to {	sangestre, a female singer.
bæcere, a male baker		bæcestre, a female baker.
fidelere, a male fiddler		fidelestre, a female fiddler.
webbere, a male weaver		webbestre, a female weaver.
rædere, a male reader		rædestre, a female reader.
seamere, a male seamer		seamestre, a female seamer (or <i>seamstress</i>).

The single word *spin-ster* still retains its feminine force.

INFLECTION.

§ 83. Inflection is a special part of Derivation. It consists of (1) the Declension of Nouns, and (2) the Conjugation of Verbs. We begin with Nouns.

The declension of a noun gives its signs of (1) Gender, (2) Number, (3) Case.

The words *boy* and *girl*, *father* and *mother*, *horse* and *mare* are the names of living beings of different sexes—*boy*, *father*, and *horse*, the names of males; *girl*, *mother*, and *mare* of females.

In grammar, however, instead of saying that the word *boy* is a *male* word, and the word *girl* a *female* word, we use the terms *masculine* and *feminine*; and we say that *boy* is a word of the masculine gender, and *girl* a word of the feminine gender. But besides such objects as *boys* and *girls*, which are either male or female, there are in the world a vast number of objects, such as *swords*, *bows*, *shoes*, *iron*, &c., that are neither male nor female. These objects have names, and these names are very often neither masculine nor feminine, though they are sometimes supposed to be endowed with sex, and made either males or females. Words of this sort, that are neither masculine nor feminine, are said to be of the neuter gender. We may say then that there are three genders; the masculine, the feminine, and the neuter. The masculine denotes males; the feminine, females; and the neuter *things*, or objects that are neither male nor female. We can now apply this to the words mentioned above. In the English substantives and adjectives there is no true Inflection indicative of Gender; words like *man*, *woman*, *he-goat*, *she-goat*, &c., being approximations only. In Anglo-Saxon, however, this Inflection existed, and even in the language as it is spoken at the present time, exists among the Pronouns. Thus—

The two words *him* and *her* are of the same number, in the same case, and from the same nominative. Yet they are different words, and they differ in meaning; the first being applied to *males*, the second to *females* only.

Have you seen your brother?—Yes, I have seen him.

Have you seen your sister?—Yes, I have seen her.

Now this difference of form gives a true inflection of

gender, and it is one of the peculiarities of pronouns to be changed, not only in the way of case and number, but in the way of gender also.

§ 84. *Number*.—In the following phrases we speak of a single object; that is, of one object and of no more than one; *a father, my father, this father, one father; a son, my son, this son, one son; a horse, this horse, that horse, my horse, one horse*. Here the words *father, son, and horse*, appear in a simple form, without the addition of any letter or syllable whatsoever. But this is not the case with words like *these father-s, these son-s, these hors-es, &c.* Here we speak of more objects than one; that is, of *two* (or more) *fathers, of two* (or more) *sons, and of two* (or more) *horses*; and hence the letter *s* is added to the words *father, son, and horse* respectively. Now in the Latin language the word *singularis* means *single*; so that the forms without *s*, such as *father, son, and horse*, denoting respectively *one father, one son, one horse*, and no more, are called *singular* forms, and are said to be in the *singular* number. On the other hand, in the Latin language the words *plus* and *pluralis* mean *more* or *many*; so that the forms with *s*, like *father-s, son-s, and hors-es*, denoting respectively *two* (or more) *fathers, two* (or more) *sons, two* (or more) *horses*, are called *plural* forms, or are said to be in the *plural* number. In the English language we may therefore say that there are two numbers, the singular and the plural. The singular speaks of one (*a father*), and the plural speaks of more than one (*fathers, books*).

§ 85. *Case*.—We may arrive at a knowledge of the nature of cases by examining the structure of the following propositions.

He is striking him;—these words form a proposition, of which *he* is the subject, *is* the copula, and *striking him* the predicate. Now *he* and *him*, although the same parts of speech, of the same gender, and of the same number, appear in different forms. In one there is the presence, in the

other the absence, of the letter *n* (*he*, *hi-m*). The reason of this is because the two words are in different cases. The same takes place with *they are striking them*. We cannot say *him is striking he*, nor yet *them is striking they*. We cannot even say, *him is striking, them are striking*. If we examine farther, we shall find that *he* and *they* can, by themselves, form terms; since we can say not only *he is striking*, but *this is he*, and *these are they*. On the other hand, *him* and *them* can only form parts of terms: as *he is striking them*, *they are striking him*. Such is the difference in meaning between the words *he* and *him*.

When the words differ from each other in meaning in the way that *he* and *him*, *they* and *them* differ, it is the habit, more or less, of languages to express this difference of meaning by a difference of form. This is done with the words just quoted; where *he* and *they* take one form, and *him* and *them* another. Differences of this sort, expressed by difference of form, are said to constitute cases. The word *he* is in one case (the nominative), the word *him* in another (the accusative or objective). So it is also with *they* and *them*.

A noun is said to be in the nominative case when it can by itself constitute a term. The words *he* and *father* are nominative cases; since we can say, *he is speaking*, *father is coming*, *this is he*, *this is father*.

They fought with a sword.—Here there is the substantive *sword* accompanied by the word *with*. In many languages, however, the word *with* would be omitted, and the word *sword* change its form. The Anglo-Saxon for *they fought with the sword*, was *feoh-ton sweord-e*, where no such word as *with* appeared in the sentence, but where the additional syllable *-e* served instead. This constituted in Anglo-Saxon a particular case.

This is a picture of John.—Here there is the substantive *John* accompanied by the word *of*. In many languages, however, the word *of* (or its equivalent) would be omitted, and the word *John* would change its form. This would

constitute a fresh case. The meaning of the sentence *this is a picture of John* is, *this is a picture of which John is the subject* (or *original*).

§ 86. These three inflections, viz. Gender, Number, and Case, belong to the declension of nouns. They are true inflections, which the following are *not*.

Difference of sex expressed by composition.—

Male.	Female.
<i>he-goat</i>	<i>she-goat</i>
<i>cock-sparrow</i>	<i>hen-sparrow</i>
<i>man-servant</i>	<i>maid-servant</i> .

Here objects of different sexes are expressed by *partially* different words, and the result is a compound.

Difference of sex expressed by derivation.—The words in the first column are the names of males, those in the second of females.

Male.	Female.	Male.	Female.
actor	actr- <i>ess</i>	duke	duch- <i>ess</i> .
lion	lion- <i>ess</i>	peer	peer- <i>ess</i> .

Here the names of females are formed from those of males by the addition of the syllable *ess*. The result is an ordinary derivative; of *French* origin.

When we come to the *conjugation of verbs* we shall meet with other Inflections, viz., those of Person, Tense, and Mood. Of these the first two are the most truly Inflectional, in the present English. The Infinitive Mood has lost its original termination *-en*; and so has the Conjunctive. Of this mood the signs for all the Persons except the Third Singular are the same as those of the Indicative. The difference between *he speaks* and *if he speak* is neglected; and, even adhered to, it gives us only a *negative* sign of Mood, i.e., the omission of the *s* of the Indicative.

INFLECTION, ETC., OF PRONOUNS.

§ 87. *The Pronouns—why considered first.*—The pronouns come first under notice on account of the fulness of their declension. They are not, however, in this respect all alike.

Words like *some*, *same*, *each*, &c., have no more signs of gender, numbers, or case than the adjective; and this means that they have none at all. *Self*, *one*, and *other* are declined like substantives.

But the (1) demonstrative, (2) interrogative, and (3) relative pronouns, which are all declined on the same principle, have a true distinction of gender, and, at least, three oblique cases.

The demonstrative, interrogative, and relative pronouns have all a neuter in *t*, a possessive in *s*, objectives in *m*, *n*, or *r*, according to the gender; *it*, *what*, *his*, *whose*, *him*, *whom*, *when*, *her*, *where*. *I-t*, *tha-t*, and *wha-t* are true neuter signs; *t* being the original sign of the neuter gender. In the present Danish, Swedish, Norwegian, and Icelandic, and in the old Norse and Mæso-Gothic, *all neuter adjectives* as well end in *-t*.

§ 88. Demonstratives.—The demonstrative pronouns derive their name from the Latin word *demonstro*=*I show*, or *point out*.

Of demonstrative pronouns there are three varieties, viz. :

1. True demonstratives.—*This*, *that*, *yon*.
2. Demonstratives which partake of the nature of the personal pronouns—*he*, *she*.
3. The definite article, *the*.

True demonstratives.—*This* applies to comparatively near; *that* to comparatively distant; *yon* to remote objects.

Yon is undeclined. *This* and *that* are declined in respect to number only.

The old and proper plural of the demonstrative and definite article *pe*, *pio*, *pæt*, was *pá*, *pæ*, *tha*, *thea* or *tho*, without any sound akin to that of the semivowel *y*, as in *they*. This was when *he* had a plural number (*hi*, *heora*, *heom*) of its own; now superseded by *they*, *their*, *them*. When this plural of *he* became obsolete, a double change affected the plural of *pe*: (1) the vowel *á* became *-e*, *-ei*, or *-ey*—

þey, *thei*; (2) *þú, þo* took the affix *-s*, the forms *they* and *those* being the result.

He is found in the singular number only.

	Masculine.	Feminine.	Neuter.
Nominative:	<i>he</i>	—	<i>it.</i>
Possessive:	<i>his</i>	<i>her.</i>	<i>it-s.</i>
Objective:	<i>him.</i>	<i>her.</i>	<i>it.</i>

She is now undeclined.

The nature of the demonstrative pronouns is only understood through their history. In the older stages of our language, the words *this* and *that* were fully declined and had both possessives and objectives. More than this, they had two other cases; the dative and the instrumental. To say that this inflection is wholly lost, would be inaccurate. It still exists, though in an altered form and as a different part of speech.

Certain words, which at the present time are adverbs, were originally demonstrative pronouns. Thus:

There was a dative case, of the singular number and feminine gender, meaning *in that direction*; the word *direction* being understood.

Then was in the objective case, masculine gender, and singular number. It meant *at that time*; *time* being understood.

The word *the* in such expressions as *all the more*, *all the better*, *the more the merrier*, is more remarkable still. It means *by so much*; and was, originally, an instrumental case. The Anglo-Saxon form was *þy* (*thy*); corresponding in power to the Latin *eo* (*eo majus*). Its present identity of form with the definite article is accidental; the origin of the two words being different.

In like manner, *here* was the dative feminine of *he*; and meant *in this direction* or *place*.

It, in its present form, has no evident connection with *he*; of which, however, it is the true neuter. The older form is *hit*.

Its is a strange word and a new word. The original neuter possessive was *his* for the masculine and neuter genders. From a comparison by Mr. Watts of the different versions of the Bible it appears that 'so lately as 1611—the date of the issue of the authorized version—the word did not exist, or, at all events, was not considered to belong to that elevated portion of the language regarded as suitable for the translation of the sacred writings.'

And thei shulen take the iacyntyn mantle with the which thei shulen cover the candelstik with the lanterns and *her* (*their*) toonges & snyters.—*Wicliffe*.

Thei schulen also take a meatie of iacynt, with which thei shulen hile (cover) the candelstike with these lanternes and tongis and snytels.—*Purvey*.

And they shall take a cloth of jacyncte and cover the candelstick of light and *her* lamps and *her* snuffers and fyre pans and all *hir* oyle vessels which they occupy about *it*, and shall put upon *her* and all *her* instrumentes a couerynge of taxus skin and put it upon stauces.—*Tyn-dale*, 1530.

And they shal take a yalowe clothe and cover the candelsticke of light therewith, & *her* lamps with *her* snuffers, and outquencherers.—*Co-verdale*, 1535.

And they shall take a cloth of iacinete and cover the candelstykke of lyght and *her* lampes and *her* snuffers and fyre panes and all *her* oyle vessels which they occupy aboute it, &c.—*Mathews*, 1537.

And they shall take a cloth of blue and cover the candlestick of the light and *his* lamps & *his* tongs, and *his* snuffdishes, and all the oil vessels thereof wherewith they minister unto it.—*Authorized Version*.

The feminine of *he* was *heó*. This has been lost. In Anglo-Saxon, however, the inflection was—

Masculine.

He

Feminine.

heó

Neuter.

hit.

Beside which there was an accusative form *hine*. *Him* was originally dative.

In the plural the changes have been greater still. Instead of *they*, *their*, and *them*, the Anglo-Saxons said *hi*, *hira*, *hem*; all of which forms were true inflections of *he*, and all of which are now lost. To make up for them, the existing plurals have been borrowed from another quarter.

She was originally the feminine of *se*, and served as the definite article; as *se hlaforð*=the lord; *seo hlafdige*=the lady. At the present time the masculine *se* no longer exists, whilst, in the feminine, *she* stands in the place of the Anglo-Saxon *heo*.

These changes being understood, it is easy to see how inaccurate it is to talk of *she* being the feminine, and *they* being the plural, of *he*. The different words belong to different systems, and are no more the masculines and feminines of one another, than (to use a well-known illustration) *puss* is the vocative case of *cat*.

§ 89. Of the two powers of the pronoun *who*, the *Interrogative* is the older; its use as a *Relative* being secondary.

The neuter form is *what*; the possessive, *whose*; and the objective, *whom*.

The adverbs *where* and *when* were originally dative and accusative cases from *who*; in other words, the remarks that applied to *here*, *there*, and *then*, apply to *where* and *when*.

Again,—*why* was originally the instrumental form *hwī*; meaning, *for what reason*; in Latin, *quā causā*?

Which is no true neuter, no true inflection. It is a compound of the radical of the relative and the adjective *like*.

The Scotch form still possesses the *l*; as *whilk*. So does the German *welch-e*. *Such* is a similar compound from *so-like*, in Scotch *swilk*, in German *solch*.

Whose.—This is the way of writing *whoes* or *who's*. It disguises to a slight extent the nature of the word, which is, in respect to its sound, as regular a possessive case as *father's* or *man's*.

The relatives, as already stated, differ from the interrogative only in their syntax.

§ 90. *The true personal pronouns*.—*I*, *me*, and *we* denote the *speaker*. *Thou* and *ye* the person *spoken to*.

I is found in the nominative case and singular number only.

Me has no nominative case. Its possessive is *my*, its objective *me*.

Forms of the *first* personal pronoun, *singular*—*I—me, my.*

Forms of the *first* personal pronoun, *plural*—*we, ours, us.*

Forms of the *second* personal pronoun, *singular*—*thou, thee, thy.*

Forms of the *second* personal pronoun, *plural*—*ye, you, your.*

The true possessive pronouns.—*This is my book; this is a book of mine.* In each of these propositions we make an assertion as to the nature of a *book*. We state what the book is in regard to ownership or *possession*. We assert that it is *my book*, that it is a book belonging to *me*, that it is a book of *mine*, and not any other person's.

Between, however, the words *my, thy, our, your, her, and their* on one side, and *mine, thine, ours, yours, hers, theirs* on the other side, there is the following difference. *My, thy, our, your, her, and their* signify possession, because they are possessive cases. *Mine, thine, ours, yours, hers, theirs* signify possession for a different reason. They partake of the nature of adjectives, and in all the allied languages are declined as such.

In opposition to the words *my, thy, our, your, her, their*, they may be called the true possessive pronouns. Respecting the difference between these two classes of words, more may be seen in the Syntax. Those who are familiar with the classical languages may at once comprehend the distinction. *My* and *thy* are the equivalents of *mei* and *tui*; *mine* and *thine*, of *meus* (*mea, meum*) and *tuus* (*tua, tuum*); and, like *meus* (*mea, meum*) and *tuus* (*tua, tuum*), *mine* and *thine* were once declined.

In *hers, theirs, ours, yours*; or *her-s, their-s, our-s, your-s*; the analysis is *he-r-s, thei-r-s, ou-r-s, you-r-s*. Although adjectival in meaning, these forms originated as cases; and that since the Anglo-Saxon period. The *-s* is the *s* of the genitive case; so that, in these words, we have a case formed from a case.

§ 91. *One* and *man*.—These are what are called the indeterminate pronouns. The latter has been entirely superseded by the former. Yet they both have the meaning. The one, however, is a word of French, the other of German origin.

a. *One* is the French *on*, as in *on dit*=one (i.e. the world at large, or Man in general) says. The older form is *homme*, which is the Latin *homo*=man.

b. Before the Norman Conquest, or during the true Anglo-Saxon period, the word was *man*, just as it is at the present time in German, where *man sagt*=*dit*=*one says*=they say. It presents itself as *me*; the vowel being changed and the *n* dropped; the dropping of the *n* being conspicuous in the Frisian as a rule, and of the West-Saxon in this particular word; where it is *me*.

The *reflective* pronoun *self* is chiefly connected with syntax. In respect to their etymology, *self*, *other*, and *one* are declined as *substantives*.

	<i>Singular.</i>		
<i>Nominative</i>	self	other	one
<i>Possessive</i>	self's	other's	one's
	<i>Plural.</i>		
<i>Nominative</i>	selves	others	ones
<i>Possessive</i>	selves'	others'	ones'.

That some of these forms are rare is certain. Such expressions, however, as *one is unwilling to put one's friend to trouble*, or *my wife and little ones are well*, or *these are my two little ones' playthings*, are common.

§ 92. The *-s* in *this*, *these*, and *those*.—These three words are compounds of the roots *the* and *se*; both Demonstrative. In the word *those* (§ 88) the *-se* is a late addition. In *this* and *these*, however, it is found in the oldest specimens of our language.

NUMERALS.

§ 93. *Cardinal Numbers*.—It rarely happens that the whole of the Cardinal Numbers are, in any language, de-

declined throughout. *One* is naturally singular; so that it has no need to take any particular form in order to distinguish it from a plural. In like manner the rest of the numbers are naturally plural, so that words like *five* and *six* have no need of taking any particular form to distinguish them from singulars. These facts do away with the necessity of any forms expressive of number. The expression of case and gender is not so naturally superfluous; and, hence, in many languages the earlier numerals are declined. In the present English all the cardinals are undeclined. One antiquated word, however, preserves a trace of an earlier Anglo-Saxon declension. The word *twain* was originally the Accusative masculine of *twá* (*twá-n*, A. S. *twegen*).

§ 94. As a *Number*, the word *first* is the ordinal of *one*. As *words* they have no connection. There is no such word as *on-th*; while *fir-st* is a derivative from *fore*. This difference between the Cardinals and the Ordinals of 1, as *words*, is common throughout the class to which the German class of languages belongs. German *ein*, *erste* (derived from *ere*=before); Latin *unus primus*, Greek *ἕν πρῶτος*.

As a *Number*, the word *second* is the ordinal of *two*. As *words* they have no connection. *Second* is the French *second*, from the Latin *secundus*; which is, itself, a form of *sequundus*, from *sequor*=I follow. In English there is no such word as *two-th*. There *is*, however, in German *zwei*, *zweite*. Hence the difference: the Cardinal and Ordinal which we have noticed as very general in the *first* numeral, is less so in the second.

In the word *third* and those that follow, no such differences will occur. The Ordinal will be formed from the Cardinal by the addition of *d* or *th*, subject to slight variations.

§ 95. *Numerals from 13 to 19 inclusive*.—Here the affix *-teen* is another form of *ten*. It denotes *Addition*: i.e. *thirteen*=3+10.

§ 96. *Numerals from 20 to 90 inclusive.*—Here the affix *-ty* is, also, connected with the word *ten*, though not so closely. The fuller form of *ty* is *tig-*; and the *g* in *tig* is the κ in the Greek $\delta\epsilon\kappa\text{-}a$, and the *c* in the Latin *dec-ena*.

Tig means a Collection of Ten, or a Decad, and, so doing, denotes multiplication; i.e. *twen-ty* = 2×10 , or two tens.

Nom. Fjórir tigr manna = 4 decads of men.

Acc. Fjóra tigr manna = 4 „ „

Dat. Fjorum tigrum manna = to „ „

Gen. Fjögurra tigr manna = of „ „

§ 97. *Possessive and Objective as names of English cases.*—*Possessive* is the English name for the *Genitive* case in Latin, Greek, and other languages; and, in English, the two terms are sometimes used indiscriminately. But the alteration is an improvement. In the vast majority of cases the English form in *-s* denotes Possession; thus the *man's hat* means the hat of which the man is in Possession. The case is sometimes, perhaps often, used in other senses; but to this of Possession it is *mainly* restricted. It ends in *-s*, i.e. takes *'s* as its sign; and, if this were all, there would be nothing more to say about it. But this is not the case. Practically the *man's hat* means the *hat of the man*, and *vice versâ*. Confusion comes out of this. The word *of* passes for the *sign* of the Possessive Case; and there are few who have not considered it as such. But the true sign of the Possessive Case is *'s*; and, in the combination *hat of the man*, the word *man*, whatever else it may be, is *not* a Possessive Case.

The fact is that in *the hat of the man* we have no case at all, but a combination of words instead of one—which is a very different thing. This, alone, is an instance of confusion. But it may be said that *of* governs a Possessive Case, and that, for this reason, the Combination is as truly Possessive as the Inflection. It may or not be this. If it were, however, we should expect, instead of the form *man*, *the Possessive* form *man's*—which we do not find.

This will be further considered in the sequel. At present it is enough to say that *of* is not the sign of a Possessive or Genitive Case, in the way that *'s* is.

§ 98. *The Objective Case.*—Objective, like *Possessive*, is a new name. The innovators, however, who introduced it showed good judgment. They preferred it to the old word Accusative. This was because, though the Objective Case *in the main* coincided with the Accusative, it was, to a considerable degree, made-up out of other Cases as well. The Objective, then, is an Accusative and something more.

§ 99. *Virtual Inflections.*—There was, then, a time when the single case which is now called *Objective* consisted of two, three, or perhaps more cases, each with a name of its own. One of these was, certainly, an Accusative; and another Dative. Indeed, at the present moment, a third case still survives, though only found in Pronouns—*he, his, him*. This last word is called an Accusative. In Anglo-Saxon, however, it was no Accusative, but a Dative; and of the Dative rather than the Accusative *m* was the sign. The sign of the Accusative was *n*. Hence, the form that corresponded with the Latin *eum* was *hene*, whereas *him* = *ei*. Again, in a few old words a genuine Instrumental Case is to be found. All these are now massed together under the general name Objective. Still, there are times when it is necessary to ask to what particular division of the Objective such or such a word should be referred. Few would deny that in such phrases as *give it him, it is like him*, the original Dative character of the form still maintains itself. Such cases may be called Virtual.

SUBSTANTIVES.

§ 100. A Substantive is an *invariable* name, capable of forming, by itself, either the subject or the predicate of a proposition. The Pronoun, as we have seen, can do the same; but the Pronoun differs from the Substantive in being a *variable* name. See §§ 192–200.

The Declensions of the Substantive are those of (1) Number, and (2) Case.

The Numbers are two—the Singular and the Plural.

The only *Case*, with a distinct sign, is the Possessive; and even this does not distinguish it from the Plural Number—not, at least, in the language as it is *spoken*. This is because both the Nominative Plural and the Possessive singular end in *-s*; so that, when a word like *fathers* or the like stands alone, we have no means of knowing of what the sound *s* is a sign. When it stands in a sentence, and in the relation with other words, its import is more easily seen—for the context helps us. Still there is always the possibility of ambiguity of some kind. In *writing* we remedy this by the insertion of the so-called Apostrophe, *i.e.* an inverted comma. Hence, whilst the *fathers of the families* gives us a Plural Number, the *father's children* means the *children of one father*, and is a Possessive Case. This, however, is not so much a process of Language as an artificial contrivance in the way of a substitute. In unwritten languages it can have no existence.

But the ambiguity in the spoken language did not always exist. The Anglo-Saxon sign of the Possessive was *-es*, *e.g.* *cýning=king—cýning-es, king's*; while that of the Plural was *-as*, *e.g.* *cýning-as, kings*.

§ 101. *The Possessive Plural*.—This, like the Apostrophe in the Possessive Singular, is, to a great extent, artificial. In the Anglo-Saxon there was, certainly, a sign of the Possessive Plural; but it was *-a*—not *-s*, as *cýninga=kings'=of kings=reg-um*. Here the present English again addresses itself to the eye, and by altering the place of the Apostrophe we get such forms as the *fathers' children=the children of different fathers*. But between this Plural *s'* and the Singular *'s* there is this notable difference. The Singular *s* is a real one. The *s'* of the Plural has no existence at all; for the *s* in words like *fathers'* is simply the *'s* in the *s* of the Nominative. If there were a true sign of a

Possessive Case, the full forms would be the *father-s-es children*; the *master-s-es men*, &c. It is probable that if such combinations existed, we should soon drop them, on account of the accumulation of *esses*. But it is also probable that they never existed. In the few words where the Plural does *not* end in the sound of *s*, we have a true Possessive sign—e.g. *men's*, *children's*, *oxen's*; and, so far, they are real, rather than artificial.

§ 102. The result of these uses of *s* is that, with few exceptions, it stands for two cases and two numbers. Indeed, as a sign of Inflection, it is the only one which the Declension of the Substantive supplies. Even here, it speaks more to the eye than the ear. We spell it as if it were *s*; but, in the great majority of cases, we sound it as *z*.

In some cases we are obliged to do so—

1. Thus: *slabs*, *slaves*, *lads*, *blades*, *dogs*, &c., are words which we can spell, but which we cannot pronounce. We pronounce them *slabz*, *slävz*, *ladz*, *blädz*, *dogz*, &c.

2. Words like *hills*, *drums*, *hens*, *bars*, *days*, *fleas*, *bows*, &c. we *can* pronounce as they are spelt; but we do not. The *s*, in all these words, and in all words like them (*i.e.* all words ending a liquid or a vowel), is sounded as a *z*.

3. If the last sound of the singular be that of *s*, *z*, the *sh* in *shine*, or the *z* in *azure*, the addition is that of the sound of the syllable *-ez* (spelt *-es*); as *loss-ez*, *kiss-ez*, *blaz-ez*, *haz-ez*, *blush-ez*, *lash-ez*, spelt *loss-es*, *kiss-es*, *blaz-es*, *haz-es*, *blush-es*, *lash-es*.

The true rule, then, for the Inflections of the Substantive is that it consists of the addition of the *sound* of *s* *modified according to the termination of the root*.

§ 103. *Plural of certain words in f.*—The following words end in the sharp mute *f*—*loaf*, *half*, *wife*, *life*, *calf*, *leaf*. Now, according to § 102, their plurals should be formed by the addition of the sound of *s* in *seal*, and so be *loafs*, *halfs*, *wifes*, *lifes*, *calfs*, *leafs* (pronounced *loafce*, *halfce*, *wifce*, *lifce*,

calfee, leafce). This, however, is not the case. Their plurals are formed by the addition of the sound of *z* in *zeal*, and are *leaves, halves, wives, lives, calves, leaves* (pronounced *loavz, halvz, wivz, livz, calvz, leavz*); the sound of the *f* being changed into that of *v*. Respecting these words we must observe:

1. That the vowel before *f* is *long*. Words like *muff*, where the vowel is short, form their plurals by means of the sounds of the *s* in *seal*; as *muff, muff-s* (pronounced *muffce*).

2. That they are all of Anglo-Saxon origin. In the words *mischiefs, chiefs, handkerchief, grief, relief*, the plural is formed as in *muff*; that is, by the addition of the sound of *s*; *mischiefs, chiefs, &c.*

Putting these two facts together, we can use more general language, and say that

When a word ends in the sound of *f*, preceded by a long vowel, and is of Anglo-Saxon origin, the plural is formed by the addition of the sound of the *z* in *zeal*.

To this rule there are two exceptions.

1. *Dwarf*; a word of Anglo-Saxon origin, but which forms its plural by means of the sound of *s*—*dwarfs* (pronounced *dwarfce*).

2. *Beef*; a word *not* of Anglo-Saxon origin, but which forms its plural by means of the sound of *z*—*beeves* (pronounced *beevz*).

If we ask the reason of this peculiarity in the formation of the plurals of these words in *-f*, we shall find that it lies with the singular rather than the plural forms. In Anglo-Saxon, *f* at the end of a word was sounded as *v*; and it is highly probable that the original *singulars* were sounded *loav, halv, wive, calv, leav*.

§ 104. *Plural forms in -ce*.—1. The word *penny* should form its plural by means of the sound of *z* in *zeal*. It does so, and consequently, there is the plural form *pennies* (*penniz*). But, besides this, there is the form *pence*.

Now there are two plurals to the word *penny*, because there are two meanings. *Six pennies* means *six separate penny-pieces*. *Six pence*, or *sixpence*, means a *single coin equivalent to six penny-pieces*. This last sense is Collective rather than Plural.

The plural *pence* has a further peculiarity. According to § 102, it ought to end in the sound of *z* in *zeal*, which it does not: it ends in the sound of *s* in *seal*. This serves to distinguish it from the plural of *pen*, which is *penz* (spelt *pens*).

2. *Dice*.—This word ends in the sound of *s* in *seal*, instead of that of *z* in *zeal*. This serves to distinguish *dice* for play from *dies* (*diez*) for coining.

§ 105. *Equivocal forms from Singulars in s*.—The number of the following words has always been a matter of discussion amongst Grammarians.

1. *Alms*.—The *-s* is no sign of the plural number, but part of the original singular, like the *s* in *goose* or *loss*. The Anglo-Saxon form was *ælmesse*. Notwithstanding this, we cannot say *alms-es* in the same way that we can say *loss-es*. Hence the word *alms* is, in respect to its original form, singular: in respect to its meaning, either singular or plural.

2. *Riches*.—The *-s* is no sign of the plural number, since there is no such *substantive* as *rich*; on the contrary, it is part of the original singular, like the *s* in *distress*. The form in the original French, from which language it was derived, is *richesse*. Notwithstanding this, we cannot say *richess-es* in the same way that we can say *distresses*. Hence the word *riches* is, in respect to its original form, singular; in respect to its meaning, either singular or plural: most frequently the latter.

3. *News*.—The *-s* here is no part of the original singular, but the sign of the plural, like the *s* in *trees*. Notwithstanding this, we cannot subtract the *s*, and say *new*, in the same way that we can form *tree* from *trees*. Hence the

word *news* is, in respect to its original form, plural ; in respect to its meaning, either singular or plural : most frequently the former.

4. *Means*.—The *-s* is no part of the original singular, but the sign of the plural, like the *s* in *trees*. The form in the original French, from which language the word is derived, is *moyen*, singular ; *moyens*, plural. If we subtract from the word *means* the letter *s*, we say *mean*. Now, as a singular form of the word *means*, with the sense it has in the phrase *ways and means*, there is, in the current English, no such word as *mean*, any more than there is such a word as *new* from *news*. But, in a different sense, there is the singular form *mean* ; as in the phrase *the golden mean*, meaning *middle course*. Hence the word *means* is, in respect to its form, plural ; in respect to its meaning, either singular or plural.

5. *Pains*.—The form in the original French, from which language the word is derived, is *peine*. The reasoning that has been applied to the word *means* is closely applicable to the word *pains*.

6. The same also applies to the word *amends*. The form in French is *amende*, without the *s*.

7. *Mathematics, Physics, Metaphysics, Optics, Politics, Ethics, Pneumatics, Hydraulics, Hydrostatics, Mechanics, Dynamics, Statics*.—All these words are plural in form ; in sense they are either singular or plural.

The words just noticed may be called equivocal forms. In words like *alms* and *riches* the original *s* of the singular is confounded with the *s*, the sign of the plural. In the remainder the *s*, the sign of the plural, is taken for a part of the original singular. This confusion prevents the words in point from having either true singulars, like *new*, *mean*, *pain* ; or true plurals, like *riches-es*, *alms-es*.

If the reason of this confusion be inquired into, it will be found,

1. That all the words in question are of foreign origin.

2. That in sense they are partly singular and partly plural. *Alms* means either a number of separate donations taken severally, or a number of separate donations dealt with as a single act of charity. In the first case the plural, in the second the singular, sense predominates.

§ 106. *Signs of Number not ending in -s.*—Besides the usual plural forms in *s*, there are four other methods in English of expressing a number of objects.

§ 107. *Change of vowel.*—This class consists in the present English of the following words:

1. *Man*, singular; *men*, plural. The vowel *a* changed to the vowel *e*.

2. *Foot*, sing.; *feet*, pl. The vowel *oo* (sounded as the *ou* in *could*) changed to the vowel *ee*.

3, 4. *Tooth*, sing.; *teeth*, pl.: *goose*, sing.; *geese*, pl. The vowel *oo* (as in *food*) changed to *ee* as in *feet*.

5, 6. *Mouse*, *louse*, sing.; *mice*, *lice*, pl. The diphthong *ou* changed to the vowel *i* (as in *night*). The combination *ce* used instead of *se*, for the same reason as in *pence* and in *dice*, i. e. lest, if written *mise*, *lise*, the words should be pronounced *mize*, *lize*.

§ 108. *Addition of -en or -n.*—In the present English the word *oxen* is the only specimen of this form in current use. In the older stages of our language the number of words in *-en* was much greater than at present.

<i>hos-en</i>	= hose or stockings	<i>scher-en</i>	= shire-s
<i>shoo-n</i>	= shoe-s	<i>doght-r-en</i>	= daughter-s
<i>ey-ne</i>	= eye-s	<i>austr-en</i>	= sister-s
<i>bischop-en</i>	= bishop-s	<i>uncl-en</i>	= uncle-s
<i>eldr-en</i>	= elder-s	<i>tre-en</i>	= tree-s
<i>aru-en</i>	= arrow-s	<i>souldr-en</i>	= soldier-s.

§ 109. *Childer.*—Here the analysis is *child-er-en*, the *en* being the *en* in *ox-en*, and the *er* or *-r*, that of *child-er*, which is the ordinary Northumbrian form. In A. S. the *r* was followed by an *-u*, the sign of the nominative case in the

declension to which the word belonged. *Eg*=egg, *lam*=lamb, *cealf*=calf were thus declined, the plurals being *ægru*, *lambru*, *ceafru*; *eggs*, *lambs*, *calfs*. From the first we get the word *eyry* or *eggery*, applied to the nest of the eagle. To the second we owe the *b* in *lamb*, which is no part of the original word: for when *lam-*, after becoming *lam-er-u*, undergoes contraction, the euphonic insertion of *b* between the *m* and the *r* takes place, and then, because the letter *b* presents itself in the plural, it passes for a part of the simpler singular form.

§ 110. *Combination of two of the preceding methods.*—Three words occur in this class.

1. *Kyne*=cows; a plural formed from a plural by the addition of *-n*; as *cow*, *kye*, *ky-ne*. *Kye* is found in provincial English, and *cý* in Anglo-Saxon.

2. *Children*; a plural formed from a plural by the addition of *en*; as *child*, *child-er*, *child-er-en*=*children*.

3. *Brethren*; a plural formed from a plural by the addition of *-en*; as *brother*, *brether* (?) or *brethre*, *brether-en*=*brethren*.

§ 111. When the singular ends in *o*, the plural ends in *oes*; as *cargo*, *cargoes*.

When the singular ends in *y*, preceded by a consonant, the plural ends in *-ies*; as *lady*, *ladies*; *quantity*, *quantities*.

In *youth*, *oath*, *truth*, and *path*, the *th*, though sounded in the singular as in *thin*, is generally sounded in the plural as in *thine*. *Youth*, pronounced *youthz*, not *youthce*. *Truth*, pronounced *trudhz*, not *truthce*. *Path*, pronounced *padhz*, not *pathce*.

In *house*, the *s*, though sounded in the singular as in *sin*, is sounded in the plural as *z*. *Houses* is pronounced *houzez*.

The plural of *woman* is pronounced *wimmen*.

§ 112. *Current and obsolete processes.*

By adding the sound of the *s* in *seal* to the word *father*, we change it into *father-s*. Hence the addition of the sound in question is the process by which the word *father* is

changed into *fathers*. The process by which *ox* is changed into *ox-en* is the addition of the sound of the syllable *-en*.

Let us suppose that from the Latin, Greek, French, or some other language, a new word is introduced; that it is a substantive; and that it has to be used in the plural number. The formation will be in *-s*, and not in *-en*—the habit of forming plurals in *-s* being *current* or *usual*, the habit of forming them in *-en* being *obsolete*.

In all languages there are two sorts of processes, those that are in operation at a certain period, and those that have ceased to operate.

§ 113. *The Possessive Case*.—In the language as it is *spoken*, the possessive case singular is the same as the ordinary nominative plural—both ending in *-s*.

Such is the rule, to which there is only one class of exceptions. Words in *f* form their possessive case in the sound of *s* in *seal*; as *loaf's*, *wife's*, *calf's*, and *leaf's*, &c.; sounded *loafce*, *wifce*, *calfce*, *leafce*, and not *loavz*, *wivz*, *calvz*, *leavz*. We say *the wives are good-tempered*, but *the wife's temper is good*; *the loaves are well-baked*, but *the loaf's baking is good*; *the calves are well-fed*, but *the calf's feeding is good*; *the leaves are changing colour*, but *the leaf's colour is changing*.

§ 114. The possessive case singular is distinguished, in the language as it is *written*, from the nominative (or objective) case plural by the insertion of an ' between the last letter of the original word and the letter *-s*; as *father*, *father's*, *fathers*; *the father's son*; *the fathers are speaking*. This, however, is merely a point of spelling. It does not affect the spoken language.

Although at the present time identical, the possessive case singular and the nominative case plural were originally distinct. The first ended in *-es*, as *endes*=*end's*; the second in *-as*, as *end-as*=*ends*. The ejection of the vowels (*a* and *e*) reduces the two words to the same form.

The possessive case plural, when it is formed at all,

is formed, in the *spoken* language, from the nominative case of the same number, in the same way as the possessive case singular is formed ; that is, by the *addition* of the sound of *-s* ; as *children*, *children's* ; *oxen*, *oxen's* : *the children's bread* ; *the oxen's horns*.

It is rare, however, that in the *spoken* language the possessive case plural differs at all from the nominative case. As the nominative plural generally ends in *-s*, and as the possessive is also formed in *-s*, there would be too many sounds of *s* accumulated in a single word ; e.g. the possessive plural of *trees* would be *treeses*, and the possessive plural of *fox* would be *fox-es-es* ; as the *foxeses tails*. Hence, in the *spoken* language, the nominative and possessive cases plural are alike whenever the former ends in the sound of *-s*.

In the *written* language the difference between the nominative (or objective) case plural, and the possessive case plural, is expressed by the addition of an ' *after* the letter *-s* ; *the trees are in leaf*, but *the trees' leaves are coming out* ; *the ships are in full sail*, but *the ships' sails are spread*.

ADJECTIVES.

§ 115. A word capable, by itself, of forming the predicate, but not capable of forming the subject of a proposition, is called an adjective.

An adjective is not exactly the name of anything, though something akin thereto. In such an expression as *snow is white*, it cannot be said that *white* is a name. That it is a word is certain. It is also certain that it denotes a quality, or attribute. Yet it is not the name of that quality. The name of that quality is *whiteness*. Neither can it be said that *white* is quite equivalent to *white thing*.

White, then, and adjectives like it, are not names. They are, rather, words that suggest names. The true name is the Abstract, *white-ness*.

§ 116. An adjective shows that the substantive with which it is united possesses a certain quality. To say that

glass is smooth, clear, brittle, and bright, is to say that it possesses the qualities of *smoothness, clearness, brittleness, and brightness*.

Qualities may be possessed in different degrees. One piece of glass may be *brighter* than another, another may be *brighter* still, and a third the *brightest* of all. English adjectives, therefore, have degrees of comparison, viz. :—

1. The *positive* ; which gives the word in its simple form : as *bright* :

2. The *comparative* ; formed from the positive by the addition of *-er* ; as *bright-er* :

3. The *superlative* ; formed from the positive by the addition of *-est* ; as *bright-est*.

§ 117. The sign of the comparative degree is equivalent in meaning to the word *more*. In the word *bright-er*, the syllable *-er* is the sign of the comparative degree ; and the word *bright-er* is equivalent in meaning to *more bright*.

The sign of the superlative degree is equivalent in meaning to the word *most*. In the word *bright-est*, the syllable *-est* is the sign of the superlative degree, and *bright-est* is equivalent in meaning to the words *most bright*.

§ 118. The comparative degree is formed from the positive by the addition of the syllable *-er* : as *cold, cold-er ; rich, rich-er ; dry, dry-er ; low, low-er*. We have, also, just seen that *brightest* is the superlative of *bright*, or, we might say, of *bright-er*.

The following positives have no comparative, and also no superlative forms :—*good, bad, evil, ill*. There are in the current English no such words as *good-er, badd-er, evil-er, ill-er* ; or *good-est, badd-est, evil-est, ill-est*.

The following comparatives (and superlatives) have no positive forms : *worse, worst ; better, best*. There are in the current English no such words as *wor* and *bett*.

The comparative form *elder*.—The positive form *old* has two comparatives ; a) *old-er* ; b) *eld-er*. A knowledge of the following facts will account for the latter form. In

Anglo-Saxon there were several words, which, besides adding the syllable *-re*, changed the vowel.

A.S. Positive.	A.S. Comparative.	A.S. Superlative.	English.
Lang	Leng-re	Leng-est	<i>Long</i>
Strang	Streng-re	Streng-est	<i>Strong</i>
Geong	Gyng-re	Gyng-est	<i>Young</i>
Sceort	Scyrt-re	Scyrt-est	<i>Short</i>
Heah	Hy-rre	Hyh-est	<i>High</i>
Eald	Yld-re	Yld-est	<i>Old.</i>

The Anglo-Saxon form *yld-re*, then, explains the English form *elder*. The word *elder* is often used as a substantive. We say *the elders of the people*.

§ 119. *Latter*.—The word *late* has two forms for the comparative degree: (1) *later*, (2) *latter*. In the first the vowel is the *a* in *fate*; in the second, the *a* in *fat*.

More.—As late as the reign of Queen Elizabeth we find the positive form *moe*. From this *more* (*mo-er*) is regularly derived.

Nether.—The positive form *nith* is obsolete. From this, the comparative form *neth-er* (in A.S. *nīðere*) is regularly derived. In phrases like *the Netherlands*, *the nether regions*, the word *nether* means *low*, or *lower*.

Less, lesser.—This form is not satisfactorily accounted for.

Near.—This word, although, in meaning, an adjective of the positive degree, is, in respect to its form, a comparative. The *-r* is no part of the original word. The Anglo-Saxon form is *neah* for the positive; *nea-rre*, *nea-r*, and *ny-r* for the comparative. Speakers who would be shocked at calling an *idea* an *idear*, say *near* for *neah* without misgiving. Hence,

Nearer is, in respect to its form, a double comparative, *nea-r-er*.

Further.—This means *more in front*, or *more forward*. It is derived from the word *fore*, as found in *foremost*. Besides the change of the vowel from *o* to *u* (*fore*, *fur-th-er*), there is the addition of the sound of *th*. This sound was inserted

in an early stage of language. It occurs in the Old High German forms *vor-d-aro*, *for-d-oro*, *vor-d-ero*, *for-d-ar*, *fur-d-ir*, and in the A.S. *forð*, and English *forth*.

Farther.—This means *more far*, or *more distant*. It is derived from the word *far*, which appears in the following different forms: *fairra*, Mæso-Gothic; *vërro*, *vër*, *fër*, Old High German; *feor*, Anglo-Saxon; *fiarri*, Old Norse. The proper comparative is formed without the *th*; as *vèrr-ôr*, *vèrr-ôro*, Old High German. In the English word *far-th-er* the *th* is inserted, either because *far-er* is inharmonious, or from the word being confounded with *fur-th-er*.

Former.—A comparative from the original word *fore*. For the insertion of the *m* (*for-m-er*) see § 124.

§ 120. It is necessary to know that in the Mæso-Gothic the comparative degree was formed differently from the comparative degree in Anglo-Saxon, English, and the other allied languages. Instead of being formed by the addition of the sound of *-r*, it was formed by the addition of the sound of *-s* or *-z*.

Positive.	Comparative.	English.
ald	ald-iza	old, old-er
sut	sut-iza	sweet, sweeter
blind	blind-oza	blind, blind-er.

In the latter stages of languages this *s* became *r*.

In the word *worse* we may suppose that there is a remnant of the old comparative in *-s* or *-z*. The Mæso-Gothic form is *váirsiza*, the Anglo-Saxon *vyrsa*.

§ 121. The Superlative degree may be formed from the positive by the addition of the syllable *-est*; as *cold*, *cold-est*; *rich*, *rich-est*; *dry*, *dry-est*; *low*, *low-est*. This is the manner in which the greatest part of the English superlatives are formed.

§ 122. *Best*, *last*.—By comparing these with the words *bett-er* and *lat-er* (or *lait-er*), we discover that the sound of *t* has been lost. The full forms would be *bett-est* and *lat-est*.

Least.—The nature of this form has not been satisfactorily determined.

First.—A superlative from the original word *fore*.

Worst.—By referring to § 120, we shall see that the comparatives in Mæso-Gothic were formed in *-s* or *-z*. We have also seen that the Mæso-Gothic is supposed to exhibit the oldest forms of the languages allied to the English. Hence it is considered that the oldest process for forming the comparative degree consisted in the addition of *-s* or *-z*; and that it was during some later period that the sound of *-s* or *-z* became changed into that of *-r*.

By referring to § 121 it will be seen that the superlative is formed from the positive by adding *-st*, or *s* followed by *t*. Such is the view that in the present English, and in most of the allied languages, it is necessary to take. It is clear, however, that, if the comparative were formed by adding to the positive *s* instead of *r*, a different view might be taken. If the comparative degrees of words like *sweet* and *blind* were *sweet-es* (or *sweet-ez*) and *blind-es* (or *blind-ez*), just as they really were in Mæso-Gothic, we might then say that the superlative was formed from the *comparative* by adding *t*, instead of saying that it was formed from the *positive* by adding *-st*. Now this is the view really taken by J. Grimm, who, on all these points, is a high authority; in which case the word *worst* is a superlative regularly formed from the old comparative form *worse*.

§ 123. *Most.*—See § 119. ˘

Nearest.—See § 119.

Next.—The superlative of *nigh*, contracted from *nighest*. The Anglo-Saxon forms were *neah*, *nyh-st*, *neh-st*, *nyh-ste*. In A. S. the letter *h* was pronounced strongly, and sounded like *g* or *k*. This fact is still shown in the spelling; as *nigh*. In the word *next* this sound is preserved, slightly changed into that of *k*; *next*=*nek-st*.

Furthest.—See § 119.

Furthest.—See § 119.

Eldest.—See § 118.

§ 124. *Upmost*, &c.—Words like *upmost* look as if they were compounds formed by the addition of *most*.

The Anglo-Saxon language presents us with the following forms; which show that the *m* has nothing to do with the word *most*.

Anglo-Saxon.	English.
innema (inn-ema)	inmost
útema (út-ema)	outmost
siðema (sið-ema)	latest
lætema (læt-ema)	latest
niðema (nið-ma)	nethermost
forma (for-ma)	foremost
æftema (aft-ema)	aftermost
yfema (uf-ema)	upmost
hindema (hind-ema)	hindmost
medema (mid-ema)	midmost.

From the words in question there was formed in Anglo-Saxon, a regular superlative form in the usual manner; viz. by the addition of *-st*; as *æfte-m-est*, *fyr-m-est*, *læte-m-est*, *sið-m-est*, *yfe-m-est*, *ute-m-est*, *inne-m-est*.

Hence the *m* is the *m* in the words *innema*, &c.; whilst the *-st* is the sign of the superlative. Hence, we should write

mid-m-ost	not	mid-most	fore-m-ost	not	fore-most
ut-m-ost	„	ut-most	in-m-ost	„	in-most
up-m-ost	„	up-most	hind-m-ost	„	hind-most

In *neth-er-most*, &c., there is a superlative super-added to a comparative.

VERBALS AND VERBS.

§ 125. The Verbals are names of actions and of agents.

Hunt-ing is the act performed by a *hunt-er*, or the agent.

The Verbal in *-ing* is identical in form with the Present Participle. But it is this only when we compare the later forms of the two words. The Verbal Abstract

in Anglo-Saxon ended in *-ung*, as *clæns-ung*=cleans-*ing*. The Participle ended in *ande*, *ende*, or *-inde*: as *clæns-iande*.

For the present this is nearly all that need be said. We are passing from one of the chief parts of speech to another, from the Pronoun, the Substantive, and the Adjective, to the Verb and Participle. Which class is the most important is difficult to say. The Verb, by many grammarians, is looked upon as the primary part of speech, and from this view it derives its name. The Latin *verbum* means *word*, and the Verb has been held to be pre-eminently *the word* in language. Whether this doctrine be right or wrong need not now be asked. The object of the present remarks is to show that the difference between the two great classes is by no means very great; and, in order to do this, an apparent deviation from the right line of investigation has been resorted to. The Verbal is evidently derived from the Verb; and the Verb is the basis of the Verbal. Yet the Verbal, though a secondary and derived form, has been taken first. However, by thus taking it, we show more clearly the connection between the Verb and the Substantive.

§ 126. A Verb can form, by itself, *both* the Predicate and the Copula of a Proposition; as *I call*; *he speaks*.

Verbs can be resolved into their elements, and that part which coincides with the Predicate can be separated from that which coincides with the Copula. *I call*=*I am calling*; *he speaks*=*he is speaking*.

That part of the Verb which gives the Predicate is called a Participle. *Calling*, *speaking*, *called*, and *spoken* are Participles.

The words which give the Copula are *am*, *art*, *is*, *are*, *was*, and *were*.

In such propositions as *I am speaking*, *thou art writing*, *he is singing*, the words *am*, *art*, *is*, *are*, *was*, and *were* connect the subjects *I*, *thou*, *he*, *she*, *it*, *we*, *ye*, &c., with the predicates *speaking*, *writing*, *singing*, &c.

§ 127. Verbs express actions. Actions are either Intransitive or Transitive.

Intransitive actions imply an agent and an act; as *I sleep, I walk, and I live.*

Transitive actions imply an agent, an act, and an object acted on; as *I strike the ball; he loves his parents; Brutus killed Cæsar.*

Certain Transitives have Intransitives with which they correspond, and from which they are formed by changing the vowel. Thus *rise, lie, sit, fall, drink,* are Intransitive; *raise, lay, set, fell, drench,* Transitive. To *rise* is to *raise oneself.* To *fell* is to *make to fall.*

§ 128. In respect to their inflection Verbs are (1) related to the Substantive, (2) related to the Adjective, and (3) characterized by peculiarities of their own.

So far as the Verb is related to either the Substantive or the Adjective it is Declined. So far as it is characterized by peculiarities of its own it is Conjugated.

The Declension of the Verb in Anglo-Saxon was fuller than it is in the present English.

In Anglo-Saxon there was a true Infinitive Mood which ended in *-an*, as *bærnan=burn, lufian=love.* When this was preceded by *to*, *-an* became *-enne*; as *to lufienne=to love, to bærenne=to burn.*

This will perplex no one who has gone through the elements of the Latin grammar, and knows what is meant by an Infinitive Mood or a Gerund. Such a reader will at once compare *lufian=love* with *amare*; and *bærnan=burn* with *urere*; whilst *to lufienne=to love* he will compare with *ad amandum*; and *to bærenne=to burn* with *ad urendum.*

Verbs, when Conjugated, have Number, Person, Mood, and Tense.

§ 129. *Number.*—When we say *he read-s*, we speak of an action performed by one person. In this case the Verb is Singular. But when we say *they read*, we speak of an action performed by more than one person. In this case

the Verb is plural. When there is a positive distinction of form between verbs singular and verbs plural, there is a positive sign of Number. In Latin, *voco*=*I call*; whilst *vocamus*=*we call*.

§ 130. *Person*.—In the words *thou speakest*, the pronoun *thou* is of the Second Person, and the verb *speak*, when taken along with it, has attached to it the syllable *-est*. The syllable *-est* is an ending or termination. It shows that the word is taken with a pronoun of the second person. It is a positive sign of the Second Person. The sign of the Third Person is *-s*; as *he speaks*.

§ 131. *Tense*.—The forms *call* and *call-ed* are different. The presence of the *-d* is one sign, its absence another—the former being positive, the latter negative. A word with the sign of past, present, or future, time, is said to be in a certain *Tense*. The word *call* is in the Present, the word *call-ed* in the Past Tense.

§ 132. *Mood*.—When we say *John walks*, we state something as a fact. We say positively that the action of walking is going on.

When we say *John! walk!* we give orders for something to take place; *viz.* the action of walking. We do not say that the action of walking is positively taking place, or going to take place. We only express a wish, or give a command, that it should do so.

When we say *if John walk fast he will fatigue himself*, we use the word *walk* in a third sense. We do not say that the action of walking is taking place, or has taken place, or will take place. Neither do we deliver an order that it may take place. We say, however, that *if* it do take place, something else will take place also; *viz.* that the person who causes it to take place will fatigue himself. Now in this case there is the idea of conditions and contingencies. John's fatigue is contingent upon his walking fast.

In *John begins to walk*, the word *walk* is in a different

sense from any of the preceding; for it depends neither upon John, nor upon any conditional conjunctions. It depends upon *begins*. Hence—

In *John walks*, the verb is in the *Indicative Mood*.

In *John! walk!* it is in the *Imperative Mood*.

In *if John walk fast, he will fatigue himself*, the word *walk* is in the *Conjunctive Mood*; in which case the words *he will fatigue himself* form one proposition; *John walks fast*, another. The word *if* connects or conjoins the two, and this connection changes the mood.

In *John begins to walk*, the verb *walk* merely states what the action is that *John begins to perform*. And this is an action without any *direct agent*. That *to walk* is *indirectly* connected with *John* is true. It is also true that the person who *begins to walk* is a *walker*, whilst in such expressions as *John refuses to walk*, or *John ceases to walk*, there is no *walking* at all. All that John does is *to refuse*, or *to cease* to do something; and it is upon the verbs *refuse* or *cease*, not upon the substantive *John*, that the *Infinitive to walk* depends.

How slight, however, is the difference between *refusing to walk* and *refusing the action of walking!* Equally slight is the difference between a verb in the *Infinitive Mood* and a *Noun*. Slighter still is the difference between *he begins to move*, *he begins a movement*, *he begins motion*.

This makes the *Declension of the Infinitive Mood*, which was prevalent in *Anglo-Saxon*, and which is still to be found in a fragmentary form in the present *English*, intelligible. At the present moment the *Infinitives* like *to err*, though preceded by a *Preposition*, and originating in an *Oblique Case*, are, for all practical purposes, *Nominatives*. When we say—

To err is human; *to forgive*, divine :

we really use—

To err = error ; *to forgive* = forgiveness.

Signs of Number.—§ 133. In the words *a-m*, *speak-est*, *speak-s*, the sounds of *-m*, *-est*, and *-s* denote a difference of person. They also denote a difference of number, since they are found only in the singular. But this they do in a secondary way. They are truly the signs of *persons*. Hence, the only real sign expressive of a difference of number occurs in the past tense of the indicative mood of the verb substantive.

Singular.	Plural.
I was.	We were.
Thou wast.	Ye were.
He was.	They were.

In Anglo-Saxon there were other Verbs that thus changed their vowel in the Plural.

Ic arn, <i>I ran</i> .	We urnon, <i>we run</i> .
Ic ongan, <i>I began</i> .	We ongunnon, <i>we begun</i> .
Ic span, <i>I span</i> .	We spunnon, <i>we spun</i> .
Ic sang, <i>I sang</i> .	We sungon, <i>we sung</i> .
Ic swang, <i>I swang</i> .	We swungon, <i>we swung</i> .
Ic dranc, <i>I drank</i> .	We druncon, <i>we drunk</i> , &c.

Hence, there were no such forms as *ic*, *swum*, or as *we swammon*. This distinction of number is not adhered to in the present English. It is the author's opinion that the writers and speakers who say *I sang*, say also *we sang*; whilst those who say *we swum*, say also *I swum*.

Signs of Mood.—§ 134. The only instance in English of a verb in one mood being distinguished from a verb in another by any *positive* sign, occurs in the conjugation of the word *was*.

Indicative.		Subjunctive.	
Singular.	Plural.	Singular.	Plural.
I was.	We were.	If I were.	If we were.
Thou wast.	Ye were.	If thou wert.	If ye were.
He was.	They were.	If he were.	If they were.

Note.—Although in *John walks*, as compared with *if John walk*, *he will be fatigued*, there is a difference between the two verbs; the difference is only a *negative*, and conse-

quently scarcely constitutes a true distinction in form between the two moods.

Signs of Person.—§ 135. *Sign of the First Person Singular.*—In the word *am* (*a-m*) the *m* is no part of the original word. It is the sign of the first Person Singular Present Indicative. Beyond this, no word in English has, in any mood, tense, or number, any form of termination for the First Person.

§ 136. *Sign of the Second Person Singular.*—The usual sign of the Second Person singular is *-st* (originally *-s*), as *thou call-est*. It occurs both in the present and past tenses; *thou called'st*, *thou spakest*. Like the pronoun *thou*, it is rarely used except in formal discourse.

§ 137. *Sign of the Third Person Singular.*—The usual sign of the Third Person Singular is the sound of the syllable *-eth*, or of the letters *s*, *z* (or *es*); as *he call-eth*, or *he call-s*. The first of these two forms is only used in formal discourse. The Third Person is only found in the indicative mood, and in the present tense. We cannot say *if he speaketh*, or *if he speaks*; neither can we say *he called-th*, or *he called-s*, *he spak-eth*, or *he spake-s*.

Whether the addition be the sound of *s* in *seal* (as *hit-s*), of *z* in *zeal* (as *call-z*), or of the syllable *ez* (as *hiss-ez*), depends upon the same circumstances as the use of the same sounds in the possessive cases, and the nominatives plural.

Throughout the whole of the plural there are no signs of the persons; *i. e.* no changes of form:—*we call*, *ye call*, *they call*; *we called*, *ye called*, *they called*.

§ 138. In respect to Person the following peculiarities deserve notice.

Forms sungest and sangest.—In Anglo-Saxon, the word *sing*, and a great number of words like it, took in the past tense a different vowel for the second person from the one found in the first and third; *e. g.* *Ic sang*=*I sang*, *he sang*=*he sang*, were the forms for the first and third person

singular. But the *second* person singular was *þu sunge*=*thou sungest*. In this way were conjugated, amongst others, the following verbs:—*þu swumme*, *þu on-gunne*, *þu sunge*, *þu sprunge*, *þu runge*, *þu sunce*, *þu drunne*, *þu runne*=*thou swumnest*, *thou begunnest*, *thou sungest*, &c., &c.; and on the other hand, *Ic* (or *he*) *swam*, *Ic* (or *he*) *ongann*, *Ic* (or *he*) *sang*, *Ic* (or *he*) *sprang*, *Ic* (or *he*) *rang*, *Ic* (or *he*) *sank*, *Ic* (or *he*) *drank*, *Ic* (or *he*) *rann*=*I* (or *he*) *swam*, *I* (or *he*) *began*, &c., &c. There were no such forms in Anglo-Saxon as *Ic* (or *he*) *swumm*, or as *þu swamme*. Now this distinction of person is not adhered to in the present English, since it is the author's opinion that the writers and speakers who say *I* (or *he*) *sang*, say also *thou sangest*; whilst those who say *thou sungest*, say also *I* (or *he*) *sung*.

§ 139. *Second Persons not ending in -st*.—In five words the sign of the second person singular is not *-est*, but *-t*; viz. *ar-t*, *was-t*, *wer-t*, *shal-t*, *wil-t*. There are no such words as *ar-est*, *was-est*, *wer-est*, *shall-est*; and the word *will-est*, when used at all, is different in sense from *wil-t*.

§ 140. Verbs have now been considered in respect to their mood, their number, and their person, especially with respect to the last two. This is because it is by its number and person that the verb in its most characteristic form is distinguished. Where there are no persons and no numbers the verb begins to be something else. It becomes participial, and participles are, at least, as closely connected with the adjective as with the true personal verb. On the other when the verb is in the infinitive mood, a mood in which there are no persons, it is very like a substantive.

To err is human; *to forgive*, divine.

§ 141. As for the forms in *-ing*, they are so thoroughly substantival, that we shall soon see that the whole class of the so-called Present Participles is endangered: indeed, it is for the sake of preparing for this doctrine that I am in the present remarks drawing attention to the connection. A

Verb is, beyond doubt, a name; and so far as it is this, it is as good a Noun as a substantive or a pronoun, and a better noun than an adjective. Still it is not a substantive, for it is not the name of anything that has a substance, actual or conceivable. It is not a word like *fire*, *water*, *stone*, &c., that applies to an object with certain visible or conceivable attributes by which its substantive character is determined. The verb is a word which denotes a *state* or *act* of some such agent. A *horse* may run or a *man* may run. The horse may be in the act of *running* to-day, or the man may have performed the act of *running* yesterday. Or the horse or man may be *about to run* at some future time. But if I wish to have the notion of *running* as an act independent of the person who runs, I get a result of a very abstract character. I treat, however, the word *running* as a name, as the name of an act or state, as 'so far as it is this it is a noun. Such a noun is 'to err' (or 'to forgive')' in the line just quoted. Such nouns preceded by their article, but ending like a verb, are the Greek combinations— $\tau\omicron\ \phi\theta\upsilon\epsilon\iota\nu$ =*envy* in the nominative case; $\tau\omicron\upsilon\ \phi\theta\upsilon\epsilon\iota\nu$ =*of envy*, or *envy's* in the genitive, and $\epsilon\iota\nu\ \tau\tilde{\omega}\ \phi\theta\upsilon\epsilon\iota\nu$ =*in envy* dative. All this we get when we consider any state or act in the abstract or independent of either its object or its agent.

§ 142. And for such states or acts there are names. In English they end in *-ing*, and can be formed, as occasion requires, from the verb: as *hunt*, *hunt-ing*, &c. These are called Verbals. They are, however, unquestionably substantives.

For the agents in such actions there are also names, which, like the preceding, are derived from the verb. In English these end in *-er*; as *hunt-er*=the person who *performs the act of hunting* or *hunts*.

But what if the name of the agent *coalesce* with that of the action, so that the two together form but a single word? This, at the first sight, looks like a very clumsy and improbable piece of machinery; and if we suppose that it

means that *every* Nominative Case coalesces with its Verb is absurd. But, it is clear that, countless as are the number of known and conceivable actions, each one with its agents, the whole incalculable host of the latter can be reduced to *three* classes. Everything that has or will be done, or is capable of being imagined as a deed, is done by one out of three doers. It is done by either (1) the speaker, (2) the person spoken to, or (3) some one of the innumerable objects spoken about; and if each of these classes has a short and adaptable name, a coalition with the verb is a very natural result.

§ 143. Be this as it may—when such a coalition *has* taken place, the whole character of the verb is changed. It loses to a great extent its abstract and indefinite character. It becomes ‘invested with circumstances;’ for it is no longer the name of a bare action, but the name of an action *plus* that of the actor.

When verbs arrive at this condition, there is a great tendency to separate them from the noun; and, indeed, when they thus become *personal*, the difference is a great one.

As the infinitive and the gerunds are thus *impersonal*, they retain their abstract character; and may be, as they sometimes are, called *impersonal*. But the commoner names are *infinitive* and *finite*.

§ 144. A *finite* verb, then, when it gives us persons, gives us not only the action, but the agent. Doing this, it does all that is done by the impersonal verb, and much more beside. It is a combination of the impersonal verb and something else, and what this second element is likely to be has been suggested. That, in some form or other, it was a personal pronoun has long been the current opinion—an opinion right in the main, but deficient in preciseness and speciality. That there was a personal pronoun the world at large admitted. Whether it was the nominative or any *one* of the oblique cases was a question not gone into.

It is chiefly with the name of the late Mr. Garnett, among whose numerous contributions to the higher departments of philology the present doctrine stands, perhaps, the first in value, that it is most especially connected. Mr. Garnett, however, with his usual justice towards his predecessors, has indicated a suggestion of the famous Keltic scholar Edward Lhuyd.

The verb, according to Mr. Garnett (who henceforth will speak for himself), is not so much a finite verb as a verbal, i.e. a word like *teaching* or *moving*, rather than one like *teach* or *move*; the pronoun which invests it with personality being not in the nominative case, or in concord with the verb, but in the possessive case, while the verb itself is in a state of regimen or government.

'Grammarians have not been able to divest themselves of the idea that the subject of the verb must necessarily be a *nominative*; and when it was ascertained that the distinctive terminations of the verb are in fact personal pronouns, they persisted in regarding those pronouns as *nominatives*, abbreviated indeed from the fuller forms, but still performing the same functions.'

'The personal terminations in Welsh are pronouns; but it is an important fact that they are evidently *in statu regiminis*, not in apposition or concord; in other words, they are not nominatives, but oblique cases, precisely such as are affixed to various prepositions. For example, the second person plural does not end with the nominative *chwi*, but with *ech*, *wch*, *och*, *ych*, which last three forms are also found coalescing with various prepositions, *iwch*, "to you," *ynoch*, "in you," *wrthych*, "through you."

'Now the roots of Welsh verbs are confessedly nouns, generally of abstract signification; as, for example, *dysg* is both *doctrina*, and the second person imperative *doce*. *Dysg-och*, or *-wch*, is not, therefore, *docetis* or *docebitis vos*; but *doctrina vestrum*, "teaching of or by you." This leads to the important conclusion that a verb is nothing but a *noun* combined with an oblique case of a personal pronoun, virtually including in it a connecting preposition. This is what constitutes the real *copula* between the subject and the attribute. *Doctrina ego* is a logical absurdity; but *doctrina mei*, "teaching of me," necessarily includes in it the proposition *ego doceo*, enunciated in a strictly logical and unequivocal form.'

The Syntax of the Prepositions greatly strengthens the

argument; and hence the following table improves the evidence on this point.

Prepositional Forms.		Verbal Forms.	
<i>er-ov</i>	. . . 'for me.'	<i>car-ov</i>	. . . 'I will love.'
<i>er-ot</i>	. . . 'for thee.'	<i>car-ot</i>	. . . 'thou wilt love.'
<i>er-o</i>	. . . 'for him.'	<i>car-o</i>	. . . 'he will love.'
<i>er-om</i>	. . . 'for us.'	<i>car-om</i>	. . . 'we will love.'
<i>er-och</i>	. . . 'for you.'	<i>car-och</i>	. . . 'you will love.'
<i>er-ynt</i>	. . . 'for them.'	<i>car-ont</i>	} . . . 'they will love.'
		or	
		<i>car-wynt</i>	

'No one capable of divesting his mind of preconceived systems, who compares the Welsh prepositional forms with the verbal forms, will deny the absolute formal identity of the respective sets of endings, or refuse to admit that the exhibition of parallel phenomena of languages of all classes, and in all parts of the world, furnishes a strong *primâ facie* ground for the belief of a general principle of analogy running through all.'—*Philological Essays*, pp. 289–342.

Such is Garnett's doctrine; and it is given in his own words.

§ 145. *Tense*.—The question of Tense now presents itself; and of this I must say explicitly what, I hope, shows itself in almost every page of my chapters on Etymology and Syntax, viz., that by Tense I mean an Inflection.

Collections of *different* words, like *I am speaking*, are not true Tenses.

Collections, like *I shall go*, are not true Tenses.

Collections, like *I have slept*, are not true Tenses.

They are combinations of certain words which serve in the place of true Tenses; just as combinations like *of a man*, *to a man*, *from a man*, &c., are combinations that take the place of true cases.

They are not Tenses like γέγραφα=*I have written*, in Greek; nor Tenses like *monui*, *I advised* (or *have advised*), in Latin. They are rather like such combinations as *amatus sum*=*I have been loved*, in Latin; or γράψας ἔχω=*I have written*, in Greek.

They are *combinations* of more words than one ; and not one single, separate word in a changed, modified, or determinate state ; so that they belong to Syntax rather than to Etymology.

What, then, is the number of the Tenses in English, and what are they ? There is, certainly, a Present Tense ; and there is, certainly, *not* a Future Tense. Whether there be one or two Tenses of *Past Time* depends upon what we mean by the term.

If Tense mean the Time, and the Time only, to which the action or state conveyed by the verb is assigned, the Past Tense in English is one and indivisible ; and words as different as *moved*, and *spoke*, inasmuch as they denote the same period of Time, are both in the same Tense.

On the other hand, however, if fundamental differences of Form are considered to make different Tenses, the Past Tenses in English amount to two.

§ 146. Upon this point the *History* of the forms may guide us ; for it may tell us that the antagonism between the difference of form, and the identity of meaning, is not irreconcilable. It may tell us that the identity of meaning is due to the modern, recent, or advanced stage of the language in which it occurs, rather than to the language in its older form. And this certainly tells us something.

In words like *moved* from *move*, the Tense is indicated by the addition of the sound of *d*, *ed*, or *t*. In words like *spoke*, there is no addition of anything ; but there is a change of the vowel. The great majority of existing Tenses belongs to the first class, a majority so overwhelming that, for the practical purposes of teaching, it may be excusable to call the exceptions *Irregular*. Still it is well to know wherein the irregularity lies. It manifestly lies not in words like *spoke*, *swam*, *drank*, &c., being irregular forms of a single Tense, of which words like *moved*, &c. are the regular ones ; but in the fact of two different Tenses having merged their two distinctive imports into one.

One element in this distinction we can see with great clearness. We can see how there are two sorts of Past Time. We can see, within the limits of our own language, the difference between *I wrote a letter* and *I have written a letter*. The former makes the writing simply a past action. The latter connects it with the time at which the sentence is uttered. It means *I have written the letter you are asking about*; or the *letter which I promised to write*; or the *letter which I am now ready to forward you*. These and other similar illustrations show that the letter is by no means done-with at the time of speaking; but that something is still connected with it. This is called *Past Time continued up to the Present*. Sometimes, when the combination is treated as a Tense, it is called the *Perfect Past*, or the *Preterit*; *Perfect*, or, simply, the *Perfect*.

§ 147. The Greek language helps us to the next step. It gives us for the *Perfect Time*, a definite, separate, and truly inflectional Tense; and, as it has, also, an equally true one for the more indefinite Past Time, it shows us how the two Tenses may co-exist in the same language. Thus $\gamma\acute{\epsilon}\gamma\rho\alpha\phi\alpha = I \text{ have written}$; $\xi\gamma\rho\alpha\psi\alpha$ ($\xi\text{-}\gamma\rho\alpha\pi\text{-}\sigma\alpha$) = *I wrote*.

The Latin carries us a step farther. Like the Greek, it has not only two forms, but two forms of the same construction—e.g., *mo-mordi*, from *mordeo*, where, as in $\gamma\acute{\epsilon}\gamma\rho\alpha\phi\alpha$, from $\gamma\rho\alpha\phi\omega$, the form is attained by doubling the initial vowel of the root, and *rexi* (*rec-si*), which, like $\xi\text{-}\gamma\rho\alpha\pi\text{-}\sigma\alpha$, is formed by the addition of *-s*. The two Latin forms, however, like the English, have only one meaning. The identity not only of the two meanings, but of the two modes of expressing them, must be borne in mind. *Mo-mordi* not only means *I have bitten*, but it expresses its meaning by the same process; viz., the reduplication of the first letter of the root. Between the two forms, the conclusion that, so far as the *process of formation goes*, the Greek and Latin Reduplicate Perfects belong to the same Tense is legitimate. With *scrip-si*, and $\xi\text{-}\gamma\rho\alpha\pi\text{-}\sigma\alpha$, there is

a difference of another kind; but it is only a matter of detail. The Greek prefixes ϵ ; the Latin ignores it. Yet both agree in the use of s as the distinctive sign of the two Tenses of Past Time. Surely the two Tenses of the same.

Such would be the case if the Latin and Greek were identified, or separated from one another in the way of Tense, on one principle only. But such is not the case. In Greek, a word like $\gamma\rho\alpha\phi\omega$ has, as a matter of course, *two* Tenses of Past Time; and, as such, $\gamma\rho\iota\text{-}\gamma\rho\alpha\phi\alpha$, and $\epsilon\text{-}\gamma\rho\alpha\pi\text{-}\sigma\alpha$, are classified in Greek grammars. Each has its proper form, and each has its appropriate meaning; and no one thinks of their being the same Tense in a different Conjugation, still less of one being an irregular or exceptional form of the other. There are, simply, two forms with two corresponding meanings. But in Latin (and here begins the antagonism) there are *two* forms, but only *one* meaning; which, so long as we hold that difference of Tense implies difference of Time, suggests that there is but *one* Tense.

§ 148. It may be replied, that two meanings in the way of Time, if they are sufficiently near one another, may be treated as one, and that they will, then, meet the real or apparent difficulty.

But this is not all. As a general (though not an universal) rule, the words in Latin which have a Past Tense in *-s*, have no Tense at all formed by a reduplication; and *vice versâ*. There are a few exceptions. *Mordeo* has the so-called double form *mor-si*, and *mo-mordi*. *Pango* has, in like manner, *pang-s-i* (*panxi*) and *pe-pig-i*. But, generally speaking, the exception confirms the rule, *i.e.*, it shows that, in Latin, some words had both forms.

Be this, however, as it may be. It is easily intelligible that, when two forms were invested with the same meaning, one would predominate and exclude the other in some words, while some would do the same in other; and this explains the difference between the Latin and the Greek grammars. The Greek found two forms with two different

meanings to match ; and treated the forms as two different Tenses. The Latin found two forms, but only *one* import ; and treated the two as belonging to the same Tense.

§ 149. *The Mæsothetic Reduplication.*—What the Greeks and Romans did in the way of Reduplication, the Germans did also. That the Mæsothetic gives us the earliest form of the languages in general of the German family has already been stated : but, upon this peculiar point, it gives us the most valuable point of its information. It gives us the Greek Reduplicate Perfect.

Sometimes it gives it after the manner of *curro*=*I run*, and *cu-curr-i*=*I have run* (or *ran*) ; or *mord-e-o*=*I bite*, and *mo-mord-i*=*I have bitten* (or *I bit*) ; e.g.—

MÆSOTHTIC.

Present and Past.

Salt-a, sái-salt=*I leap, I leapt.*

Hait-a ; hái-hait=*I bear the name ; I bore the name,*

without a change of vowel.

Elsewhere it gives us the same Reduplication *with a change of vowel ; e.g.*—

Slép-a, sái-slép=*I sleep ; I slept, or have slept.*

Thirdly, it gives us the form which presents itself in *spoke, swam, sang, rose*, and the like, as opposed to the forms in *-d* or *-t*, or the forms like *mov-ed* and *wep-t* : forms in which the Reduplication has disappeared.

In English, as in Latin, the verbs which have forms like *spoke* have, as a general rule, no forms like *moved*, and *vice versâ* ; and in English, as in Latin, the two forms are assigned to the same tense. But in English, as in Latin, these are, as far as *history* and *structure* go, two distinct tenses.

§ 150. Historically, and in the way of structure, the forms like *spoke*, &c., belong to the same tense as the Greek *τέτινα*. This tense is the Greek *Perfect*.

In the way of meaning, or import, the English forms

like *moved* belong to the same tense as the Greek ἔ-γαρ-σ-α; though not identical in the details of their structure. This tense is called, in Greek, the *Aorist*, in Latin the *Preterit*. This latter word is the better suited for the English.

If so, it is easy to see what the two forms belong to. Forms like *spoke* are Perfects: forms like *mov-ed* Preterits. They are two tenses of the same Conjugation.

But it is better to fix our attention on what they are *not*. They are *not* different forms of the same tense, in different Conjugations; least of all are they what is called *Irregular*.

Such is the real character of a class of verbs which, until lately, have been treated in a very summary manner. Their historical identity with such true and genuine Perfects as *τέ-τυφα* and *γέ-γραφα* is undoubted. Whether, however, the recognition of them as two Past Tenses, each limited to certain words, and both conveying the same meaning, in our ordinary Grammars is practicable, is another question.

§ 151. That the class is a natural one is beyond doubt.

a. The same words, as a general rule, that appear in our own language as Perfects appear as Perfects in all the languages of the German family; in other words, the list of the so-called Irregulars is nearly the same in Dutch, German, Mœsogothic, Frisian, Danish, Swedish, and Icelandic. Some languages have more than others; but more than half of the list, in any one of the above-named languages, will be found in all the others.

b. With very few exceptions they are of German, and none of foreign, origin.

c. No new word ever takes the Perfect as its tense for past time, but always the Preterit.

d. Derived verbs form their Past tense as Preterits, even when the words from whence they are derived have a Perfect—*lie, lay; lay, laid—rise, rose; raise, raised—drink, drank—drench, drenched*.

e. In the few cases where we find *both* tenses, the Perfect is Intransitive, the Preterit Transitive—though this, by some, may be considered a refinement: ‘It *hung* till it fell to pieces’—‘It *swoll* till it burst’—‘He *hanged* the offender’—‘He *swelled* it by blowing air into it.’

f. Verbs which, in the earlier stages of English, took the Perfect form, change it in the course of time for the Preterit: *sowed*, *mowed*, *rowed*, *leapt*, *slept*, *helped*, *melt*, *sheared*, *shaped*, *squeezed*. *wash*, and others, were originally *sew*, *mew*, *rew*, *lep*, *slep*, *holp*, *molt*, *shore*, *shope*, *squoze*, and *wesh*. The converse change rarely takes place. Hence, the number of Perfects is gradually decreasing. Many, however, of the tenses which are Preterit in the Literary English are current in our Provincial dialects as Perfects: the old form being there retained longest.

That they were ‘native and home-born words’ is the remark of so old a writer as Ben Jonson. The great Ben, however, despairs of ‘beating them into proportion.’ He does his part ‘in tolling this bell to draw others to a deeper consideration of the matter.’

Wallis writes that ‘*Anomaly* scarcely touches introduced (*Exotica*) words, but only those that are native—which are all Monosyllables, or derived from Monosyllables, and, for the most, allowing for a slight change, common to us with the Germans, Flemings (*Belgæ*), and Danes.’ He does, however, venture to classify them.

§ 152. ‘*Strong*’ and ‘*Weak*’ as terms.—At present I think it safe to say that (except so far as *Defect* is Irregularity) the belief that the words in question are Irregular has died away, and that it has been doing so for the last forty years. That the recognition of them as words of different Tenses, is delayed for no very distant period is what I hope. Unless such a recognition be accomplished sooner or later the great principle of historical examination, which has thrown so much light upon the darker regions of Philology, will have done less than we expect

from it. Meanwhile, the opinion of the present time is that of a period of transition and compromise.

In the exposition and illustration of this opinion the two terms which have recommended themselves are '*Strong*' and '*Weak*.' Forms like *ρέυφα*, *momordi*, and *spoke* are constructed out of the original verb itself, by the process of changing the vowel and doubling the consonant. Forms like *ἔρυσσα*, *scripsi*, and *moved* are constructed by adding to the fundamental word something from a wholly different source. The former are called *Strong*, or self-supporting; the latter are called *Weak*, or constituted by additions extraneous to the theme or the fundamental word. As applied to such forms as *spoke* and *moved*, &c., except that they are somewhat fanciful, and (a graver objection) are used in another sense in the Declension of the Nouns, they are good terms. But except when we limit them to the form of the particular words to which they apply, and that in respect to the process from which it results, and the materials out of which it is made, they suggest something either more or less than the bare facts of the case, which are simple in character and two only in number.

1. A system of Inflection which is manifest and recognised in the Greek was originally common to the languages of the German family, and the Latin; not to mention the fact of its being as manifest in the Sanskrit as in the Greek. This gave each verb *two* Tenses of Past Time.

2. The loss of the distinction between these two sorts of Time, and the result of some words retaining the form of the Perfect and some that of the Preterit Tense.

The closer we keep these two forms to their old names of *Perfect* and *Preterit*, the more clearly do they carry with them their history.

§ 153. *The Perfect Tense*.—The characters that in the first instance determine the divisions of this class, are (1) the quantity of the Vowel, and (2) the number and nature of the consonants which follow it.

After this the numbers of times that the vowel is changed demands notice, for sometimes it is changed in the Perfect only, sometimes in the Participle as well, and sometimes in the Perfect itself it is (or was) changed with the number, e.g., in Anglo-Saxon.

	Present.	Perfect Singular.	Perfect Plural.	Participle.
A. S.	<i>Bleawe</i>	<i>bleow</i>	<i>blew-on</i>	<i>ge-blaw-en</i>
	<i>Swimme</i>	<i>swam</i>	<i>swumm-on</i>	<i>ge-swumm-en</i>
English.	<i>Blow</i>	<i>blew</i>	<i>blew</i>	<i>blown</i>
	<i>Swim</i>	<i>swam</i>	<i>swam</i>	<i>swum</i>

§ 154.

Vowel Long.

(1.) Here the *sound* in the present English is that of a Vowel, but, according to the *spelling*, the words end in the Semivowel *w*. Change from *o* or *a* to *e*. The vowel in the Participle the same as in the *Present*.

Present.	Perfect.	Participle.
<i>Blow</i>	<i>blew</i>	<i>blown</i>
<i>Crow</i>	<i>crew</i>	<i>crown</i>
<i>Grow</i>	<i>grew</i>	<i>grown</i>
<i>Know</i>	<i>knew</i>	<i>known</i>
<i>Throw</i>	<i>threw</i>	<i>thrown</i>
<i>Draw</i>	<i>drew</i>	<i>drawn</i>
<i>Fly</i>	<i>flew</i>	<i>flown</i>
<i>Slay</i>	<i>slew</i>	<i>slain</i> .

In the first five of these words *w* represents *v*. In *fly*, *draw*, it represents *g* softened into *y* or *h*, as in A. S. *ic drage*=I draw; *ic droh*=I drew; *dragen*=drawn.

In *slay* the *w* represents a *g*, softened into *h*; A.S. *ic sleahhe*=I slay; *ic sleoh*=I slew; *slagen*=slain.

(2.) The Vowel (long) and spelt *ea* with two letters followed by *l* or *r* (two of the four liquids) and *k* as a mute: change to *o*. The Vowel in the Participle the same as in the *Perfect*.

Present.	Perfect.	Participle.
<i>Steal</i>	<i>stole</i>	<i>stolen</i>
<i>Bear</i>	<i>bore</i>	<i>borne</i>
<i>Swear</i>	<i>swore</i>	<i>sworn</i>
<i>Tear</i>	<i>tore</i>	<i>torn</i>
<i>Wear</i>	<i>wore</i>	<i>worn</i>
<i>Break</i>	<i>broke</i>	<i>broken</i>
<i>Speak</i>	<i>spoke</i>	<i>spoken</i>
<i>Weave</i>	<i>wove</i>	<i>woven</i>

Most of these Perfects have, or have had, a second, obsolete, or obsolescent form, as *bare*, *stale*, *sware*, *tare*, *ware*, *brake*, *spake*. *Borne* when it means *carried* or *supported* is spelt with an *-e*; when it means *brought into the world* (Latin, *natus*) it simply ends in *-n*, *born* (Latin, *latus*).

(3.) The vowel (long), the consonant by which it is followed being a Sibilant—*s* or *z*.

Present.	Perfect.	Participle.
<i>Freeze</i>	<i>froze</i>	<i>frozen</i>
<i>Choose</i>	<i>chose</i>	<i>chosen</i>

This is rather a sub-section of the previous division than a class by itself. The difference, however, between a Sibilant and an ordinary Mute is important. It has a tendency to change into *r*, sometimes in the Plural alone, sometimes in the Participle alone, and sometimes in both the Participle and the Plural. In the present English the single word *forlorn* represents this class, and that only as a Participle, or perhaps as an Adjective. In form, however, and origin, it is the Perfect Participle of the word *lose*.

Fröre, in Anglo-Saxon *gefroren*, is used by Milton.

The parching air

Burns *frore*, and cold performs the effect of fire.

Par. Lost, II., 595.

The Anglo-Saxon conjugation of these words was more than usually complex; the Vowel changes being

four, two for the Perfect and two for the *Present* Tense, with which the Participle agreed. For *was*, which belongs to this class, see below.

Prsnt. 1st Per.	S. P.	F. P.	Perfect S.	Perfect P.	Participle.
<i>Lese</i>	<i>lest</i>	<i>lest</i>	<i>læs</i>	<i>læs-on</i>	<i>ge-les-en</i>
(<i>Ge</i>)- <i>nese</i>	<i>genist</i>	<i>genist</i>	<i>genæs</i>	<i>genæson</i>	<i>ge-nes-en</i>
<i>Ceōse</i>	<i>cȳst</i>	<i>cȳst</i>	<i>ceðs</i>	<i>cur-on</i>	<i>ge-coren</i>
<i>Dreōse</i>	<i>drȳst</i>	<i>drȳst</i>	<i>dræðs</i>	<i>drur-on</i>	<i>ge-drōr-en</i>
<i>Freōse</i>	<i>frȳst</i>	<i>frȳst</i>	<i>fræðs</i>	<i>frar-on</i>	<i>ge-frōr-en</i>
<i>Be-greōse</i>	<i>begrȳst</i>	<i>begrȳst</i>	<i>greðs</i>	<i>grur-on</i>	<i>ge-grōr-en</i>
<i>Hreōse</i>	<i>hrȳst</i>	<i>hrȳst</i>	<i>hreðs</i>	<i>hrur-on</i>	<i>ge-hrōr-en</i>
<i>Forleōse</i>	<i>forlȳst</i>	<i>forlȳst</i>	<i>forleðs</i>	<i>forlur-on</i>	<i>for-loren</i>

(4.) Vowel long, spelt with a single letter, and followed by a mute. Change from *a* to *o* (spelt *o o*). Vowel on the Participle the same as on the Present.

Present.	Perfect.	Participle.
(<i>For</i>) <i>sake</i>	(<i>for</i>) <i>sook</i>	(<i>for</i>) <i>saken</i>
<i>Shake</i>	<i>shook</i>	<i>shaken</i>
<i>Take</i>	<i>took</i>	<i>taken</i>
<i>Wake</i>	<i>woke</i>	<i>waken</i>

(5.) Vowels of the Present spelt with the letter *i*; but, in sound, a diphthong. Changed into *o* in the Perfect, in the Participle into *ī* (the *i* in pit). The vowel of the Participle that of the Present, rather than the Perfect.

Present.	Perfect.	Participle.
<i>Bide</i>	<i>bode</i>	<i>bidden</i>
<i>Bite</i>	<i>bī</i>	<i>bitten</i>
<i>Drive</i>	<i>drove</i>	<i>driven</i>
<i>Ride</i>	<i>rode</i>	<i>ridden</i>
<i>Shrive</i>	<i>shrove</i>	<i>shriven</i>
<i>Smite</i>	<i>smote</i>	<i>smitten</i>
<i>Strike</i>	<i>stroke</i>	<i>stricken</i>
<i>Strive</i>	<i>strove</i>	<i>stridden</i>
<i>Thrive</i>	<i>throve</i>	<i>thriven</i>
<i>Write</i>	<i>wrote</i>	<i>written</i>

Here, in Anglo-Saxon, the vowel was changed in the Plural, with which the Participle agreed. In both cases,

however, it seems to have been long; or, at any rate, the consonant is not doubled.

Present.	Perfect. 1st Pers.	Perfect. 2nd Pers.	Participle.
<i>Scine</i>	<i>scân</i>	<i>scin-on</i>	<i>ge-scin-en</i>
<i>Bite</i>	<i>bât</i>	<i>bit-on</i>	<i>ge-bit-en</i>
<i>Smite</i>	<i>smât</i>	<i>smit-on</i>	<i>ge-smit-en</i>
<i>Ride</i>	<i>râd</i>	<i>rid-on</i>	<i>ge-rid-en</i>
<i>Strice</i>	<i>strâc</i>	<i>stric-on</i>	<i>ge-stricen</i>

§ 155.

Vowel Short.

Followed by *m*, *n*, *ng*, or *nk*. Change to *a* for the Perfect in the Singular, to *u* for it in the Plural number. The vowel of the Participle that of the *Plural* of the Perfect.

Present.	Perfect Singular.*	A. S. Plural.	Participle.
<i>Swim</i>	<i>swan</i>	(<i>swumm-on</i>)	<i>swum</i>
<i>Begin</i>	<i>began</i>	(<i>begunn-on</i>)	<i>begun</i>
<i>Run</i>	<i>ran</i>	(<i>runn-on</i>)	<i>run</i>
<i>Spin</i>	<i>span</i>	(<i>spunn-on</i>)	<i>spun</i>
<i>Win</i>	<i>wan</i>	(<i>wunn-on</i>)	<i>won</i>
<i>Cling</i>	<i>clang</i>	(<i>clung-on</i>)	<i>clung</i>
<i>Fling</i>	<i>flung</i>	(<i>flung-on</i>)	<i>flung</i>
<i>Ring</i>	<i>rang</i>	(<i>rung-on</i>)	<i>rung</i>
<i>Sing</i>	<i>sang</i>	(<i>sung-on</i>)	<i>sung</i>
<i>Spring</i>	<i>sprang</i>	(<i>sprung-on</i>)	<i>sprung</i>
<i>Sting</i>	<i>stung</i>	(<i>stung-on</i>)	<i>stung</i>
<i>Wring</i>	<i>wrang</i>	(<i>wrung-on</i>)	<i>wrung</i>
<i>Drink</i>	<i>drank</i>	(<i>drunc-on</i>)	<i>drunk</i>
<i>Shrink</i>	<i>shrank</i>	(<i>scrunc-on</i>)	<i>shrunk</i>
<i>Sink</i>	<i>sank</i>	(<i>sunc-on</i>)	<i>sunk</i>
<i>Stink</i>	<i>stunk</i>	(<i>stunc-on</i>)	<i>stunk</i>

In the following words the *i* and *ou*, now diphthongs, represent the short sounds of *i* in *pin* and the *u* in *full*. Like *swim*, &c., they had *a* and *u* in the Plural. The Scotch retains both the short vowel and double form, the Perfect being regularly in *a*, in the Participle in *u*—as *band*, *fand*, *grand*, *wand*; *bund*, *fund*, *grund*, *wund*.

* The second Person Singular, also, takes *-u*, as *þu swumme*=*thou swummeest*.

Present.	Perfect.	Participle.
<i>Bind</i>	<i>bound</i>	<i>bound</i>
<i>Find</i>	<i>fouud</i>	<i>fouud</i>
<i>Grind</i>	<i>grouud</i>	<i>grouud</i>
<i>Wind</i>	<i>wouud</i>	<i>wouud</i>

The loss of the syllabic inflections *-an*, and *-e*, &c., for the Infinitive mood and the Present tense, by shortening the word, would encourage the lengthening of the vowel; for in *find-an*, *grind-an*, &c., the *i* was doubtless sounded as in *swim*. So it would be in *climb-an*, of which the Perfect was *clomb* or *clamb* in the Singular, and *clumb-on* in the Plural; the Participle being *clumb-en*.

§ 156. REDUPLICATION RETAINED.

(1.) *Did*. This word, in the current English of the present time, stands alone; the solitary instance of the old reduplication after the manner of *τί-τυφα*. The Anglo-Saxon form was *di-de*, Old Saxon *dē-da*; in which case it is the *first* of the two *d*'s which gives us the sign of tense, and the last of them the one that belongs to the root.

(2.) *Hight*. There is another word in the same condition as *di-d*, *i.e.* another word wherein the reduplication is preserved. Here the *g* is out of place; the better spelling being *hiht*; in Anglo-Saxon *hēht*, Mœsogothic *hái-háit*. *Hight*, however, scarcely belongs to the current language; being either obsolete, or obsolescent.

An ancient fabric raised to inform the sight,
There stood of yore, and Barbican it *hight*.

Dryden, *Mac Flecknoe*.

As *hight* is an Active verb, it is better translated 'bore the name' than 'was called;' for it is *not* a *Participle*, but a Perfect tense, and it agrees with the Greek *κάλω* (Latin *cluo*) rather than with *vocor*, *nominor*, or *nuncupor*. In both the German and Norse languages it is still the ordinary

word for 'what is your name?'—German, *wie heissen Sie?* Danish, *hvad hedde De?* The Anglo-Saxon forms were *hate*, *hêht*, *ge-hâten*.

Behight = promised. So little was this form understood in the sixteenth century that we actually find *behighteth* = *promiseth*, used by Sackville, as if from a present *behight*: cp. *ought* and *must*, originally past tenses which have acquired a present meaning.—Morris, *Historical Outlines of English Accidence*, p. 156.

§ 157. *Did*, *hight*, and *held*.—We have seen that *did* is a reduplicate form current in the present language, and by no means likely to become obsolete. It gives us two *d*'s, the import of each being undoubted. The first *d* is the sign of the tense, the second the consonant of the root. The opposite notion, to the effect that the second *d* was the *d* in *loved*, and the first the *d* of the word *do*, is exploded. The first *d* represents the reduplication.

§ 158. *Hight* differs from *did* in being obsolescent. It differs, too, in having *h* for its initial; for *h* is a breathing rather than a true articulate sound, and is by no means a very stable element at any time, especially between two vowels. In sound, then, *hight* (*hiht* best represents the old orthography *hêht* and *hâihâit*) differs from *did*; for it only gives us what we may call an historical or orthographical reduplication; in other words, the *h* is only doubled to the *eye*: and if it were spelt *hite* it would show no sign of reduplication at all.

§ 159. *Held* differs from *hight*, with which it agrees in having once been a true reduplicate form, in having not even a second *h* in the spelling; i.e. no second *h* at all. Its history, however, is that of *hiht*.

Mæso- gothic.	Old High German.	Anglo-Saxon.
<i>Hâi-hâit</i>	<i>hât</i>	<i>hêht</i> from <i>hait-an</i>
<i>Hâi-hald</i>	<i>hi-alt</i>	— „ <i>hald-an</i>

Let the *gh*, *g*, or *h*, one or both, drop out of *hiht*, and *held* may be looked upon as the result of *hâi-hald*, i.e. a

reduplication for which one of the doubled letters is lost. Such is, probably, the case; the result being that in *held* it is *not* the letter of the *root* with which the word begins, but that of the *reduplication*. If so, other words may be in the same predicament; indeed, every Perfect in our language in which there has been a reduplication, and in which, now, only one of the two consonants implied by the term remains, may be like *held*, *i.e.* may have lost its radical consonant and retain only that of the prefix. How far the present doctrine favours this view is uncertain. It is certain, however, that it favours it to a great extent. The extent to which it does so is a point for which, in a work like the present, the reader can only be prepared to expect.

§ 160. The little that is here written is written mainly with the view of correcting the notion that the verbs under notice are anything like *Irregular*. They are, with few exceptions, *Defective*, inasmuch as they have no Preterit, or no case corresponding with the Greek Aorist. And as the Verbs which *have* such a tense are generally without a Perfect, more than nine-tenths of the English Verbs are Defective. That this as a characteristic is of great importance is beyond doubt. But Defect is an explicable and common phenomenon, whereas Irregularity, when real, is inexplicable and, to say the least, rare. What the English Verbs really give us is a vast number of exceptions to such rules as Grammars of ordinary magnitude can find room for.

§ 161. The two most elaborate attempts in English to throw the class of Perfects into system are those of Professor March and Dr. Morris; and to those the reader is referred. To a great extent they agree. Professor March has five classes, one of which falls into as many sub-classes; Dr. Morris six undivided classes. The American scholar, in my mind, holds closest to the principle of taking the vowel and the consonants by which it is followed as his *basis*, and subordinating to it the changes between the

vowel of the Perfect and the Participle. Dr. Morris, who connects the evidence of reduplication with the difference or likeness between these two vowels, naturally invests them with primary importance. But the two writers should be read together. The consideration of the Perfect Tense has taken precedence of the Preterit; for it has every sign of being the older one of the two. Indeed, provided that the forthcoming view be correct, it will be something more than this. It will be, in a manner, the Tense out of which the Preterit was developed. But even if it be not this, it will still be the older Tense.

§ 162. *The Preterit Tense.*—The fullest form in which the characteristic sign of the Preterit is known is in the Plural of the Mœsogothic; where *nasi-dêd-um*=*we saved*, from the Infinitive *nasi-an*, and Present *nasi-a*. One of these two *d*'s is certainly the *d* in *moved*, *called*, &c.

But what is *d* in *nasi-d-a*? It is believed to be the Perfect of the verb *do* (*did*). If so, it had, as a Post-positive affix, incorporated with the main verb, a power akin to its present power as an Auxiliary in combinations like *I did move*.

The Mœsogothic Preterit is found in both the Indicative and the Conjunctive Moods, and also in the Dual, as well as the Singular and Plural, Numbers.

a. *Past Tense of the Indicative Mood.*

Singular.	Dual.	Plural.
1. <i>Nasi-d-a</i>	—	<i>nasi-d-êdum</i>
2. <i>Nasi-d-ês</i>	<i>nasi-d-êduts</i>	<i>nasi-d-êdup</i>
3. <i>Nasi-d-a</i>	—	<i>nasi-d-êdum</i>

b. *Past Tense of the Conjunctive Mood.*

Singular.	Dual.	Plural.
1. <i>Nasi-d-êdjau</i>	—	<i>nasi-d-êdeima</i>
2. <i>Nasi-d-êdeis</i>	<i>nasi-d-êduts</i>	<i>nasi-d-êdeip</i>
3. <i>Nasi-d-êdi</i>	—	<i>nasi-d-êdeina</i>

From the fact of this double *d* being Dual as well as Plural, the inference that that consonant is a sign of

Tense rather than one of Number is held, by the present writer, to be impaired in respect to its validity. The Dual form may have been extended to Plurals, and in the Dual the letter *d* is a very likely element.

Be this, however, as it may, the doctrine that the *-déd-* in *nasi-déd-um* is the *d* in *nasida*, the *d* in *nasi-d-a*, the *d* in *move-d*, and the *d* in *did*, is generally admitted. As a matter of philological fact, a small minority may demur to it. As a matter of opinion, it is a fact of a different kind; but still an important one.

§ 163. *The Connecting Vowel*.—The next element is the letter *i*—*nas-i-dédum*. This is the connecting link between the theme and the sign of Tense; for it belongs neither to the Tense nor the main word. The Mœsogothic has three such connectives: *nas-i-da*=*I saved*; *salb-o-da*=*I healed*; *hab-ai-da*=*I had*. The first two are found in the Anglo-Saxon *ner-e-de*=*I saved*; *luf-o-de*=*I loved*. Here *d*, and *d* only, is the sign of the Tense.

§ 164. Then follow the signs of Person—*lufod-e*, *lufod-est*; *lufod-e* with *lufod-on* for all the three Persons of the Plural.

Of these the second (*loved-st*), is the only one still in existence, though scarcely common and current.

Of the connecting vowels the *o* has become obsolete, while *-e* is becoming so, or *obsolescent*. So far as we pronounce it in the reading of the Bible, or use it for the purposes of metre, it is, in words like *blessed*, *moved*, &c., a part of the *spoken* language. In *loved*, *moved*, *stabbed*, &c., as used in ordinary language, it is a sound to the eye only; in other words, no sound at all.

When, however, the fundamental Verb ends in an Explosive Dental (*d* or *t*), the *e* is *sounded*. This is because two Dentals require to be separated by a vowel before they can be distinctly pronounced; e.g. *mend-ed*, *augment-ed*, is more easily uttered than *mend'd*, *augment't*. After *th*, however, the *Continuous* Dental *d* is attached directly to the

verb, as *wreath-d*, *breath-d*. Here the *th* is sounded as the *th* in *thine*. With *th* sounded as in *thin* no English verb ends.

If the final sound of the fundamental Verb be a Surd, *p*, *f*, *k*, or *s*, the *d* of the affix becomes *t*; in other words, is accommodated to the original consonant in respect to its sonancy. This is what we have already seen in the *s* (or *z*) of Plural Number and Possessive Case of Substantives. Indeed the change is only a portion of a general Euphonic Law.

§ 165. Subject to these Rules the formation of the English Preterit is comparatively simple. Under the first, or the one concerning the interposition of the *e* between two Explosive Dentals, the most important exception is the rejection of one of the two *d*'s, *p*, and, along with it, the connecting vowel *e*. This reduces the Preterit to the same form as the Present.

(1) Verbs ending in *-d*:

Rid	rid	rid
Shed	shed	shed
Shred	shred	shred
Spread	spread	spread

(2) Verbs ending in *-t*:

Burst	burst	burst
Cast	cast	cast
Cost	cost	cost
Cut	cut	cut
Hit	hit	hit
Hurt	hurt	hurt
Knit	knit	knit
Let	let	let
Put	put	put
Set	set	set
Shut	shut	shut
Slit	slit	slit
Split	split	split
Sweat	sweat	sweat
Thrust	thrust	thrust

When the *d* is preceded by *l*, *n*, or *r* (liquids), the *e* is ejected, and, along with it, one of the *d*'s, the other being changed to *t*.

Bend	bent	bent
Build	built	built
Gild	gilt	gilt
Gird	girt	girt
Lend	lent	lent
Rend	rent	rent
Send	sent	sent
Spend	spent	spent

In all these cases the vowel is short. When long, however, it is shortened.

Bleed	bled	bled
Breed	bred	bred
Feed	fed	fed
Lead	led	led
Read	read	read (<i>pronounced red</i>)
Speed	sped	sped
Meet	met	met

§ 166. To the second rule, or the one that *t* should follow *Surd*, I remember no exceptions. As it stands, however, at present it is a *general* rule of Euphony rather than a *particular* rule for the English Verbs, and as such it must be taken. Even as it stands it is not universal. Combinations like *plucked*, *stopd*, *misd*, &c., must, doubtless, be avoided. But there are two ways of avoiding them. The first letter may be accommodated to the second, when the result would be such combinations as *plugd*, *stobd*, and *mizd*, concerning which all that can be said is that the English Language, though it might, if it chose, adopt them, does not do so.

But, when the Main Verb ends in a Vowel or a Liquid, there is no necessity for any accommodation at all. We can, if we like, say *swelt* or *heart*, *spiet* (*pronounced spite*), or the like, as easily as we say *sweld*, *heard*, or *spied*. It is not, however, the practice of the English Language to do

so. *D* is the true sign of the Tense, and to *d* it adheres where it can.

Hence the more special rule is that, in respect to the addition of *d* or *t*, the English * Language treats Vowels and Liquids as if they were Sonant Mutes.

§ 167. But to this rule there are exceptions. They are certain words where, after a Liquid, *t*, instead of *d*, presents itself—as *deal, dealt*; *feel, felt*; *smell, smelt*; *burn, burnt*; generally when the Vowel is *short*. Sometimes, however, after a *long* one—as *mean, meant*; *dream, dreamt*. But here the Vowel is shortened.

And here the spelling is uncertain: for we write *burnt* and *burned*; *dreamt* and *dreamed*; *learned* and *learnt*.

This takes us to another division. The great exceptional cases have, hitherto, turned upon the verbs that end in *d* or *t*; or the same sounds as those of the Affix.

In words where the Vowel before a Liquid was changed, or shortened, we begin with a new series.

§ 168. In *bereāve, cleāve, creēp, keēp, leāve, lōse, sleēp, sweēp, weēp*, of which the respective Preterits are *berēft, clēft, kēpt, lēft, lōst, slēpt, swēpt, wēpt*, we have the Vowel shortened—but still the same vowel; the Consonant that follows being *not* (as in *burnt, &c.*) a Liquid. Here the Vowel is the same; but it is changed in respect to *Quantity*.

§ 169. In *tēll, tōld*; *sēll, sōld*, it changed not only in respect to *Quantity*, but to *Quality* as well; and here the

* *English* here means only the English of England. In respect to the Scotch, wherein the connecting vowel is retained where it is not wanted for the purposes of Euphony only, Mr. Murray writes that the termination is *t*. 'In the old Scotch the Past Tense and Participle were formed by adding *it, yt* to all verbs of this class. In the modern dialects this full form undergoes certain euphonic changes in accordance with the character of the preceding letter or syllable.'—p. 199. The whole section shows that in Scotland, *t* was the regular, *d* the exceptional sign of the Tense. This was possible because the Scotch kept the connecting vowel; which the English did not.

Vowel that follows is a Liquid. In Anglo-Saxon the forms were *telle, tealde; selle, sealde*.

§ 170. The three points upon which the exceptions to the rules given for the formation of the Preterit are reducible to three cases; two of which have been already noticed.

1. Those that refer to Verbs ending in *d* or *t*.

2. Those wherein the Vowel is changed.

3. Those wherein the Consonant is changed.

The first has been considered. The second has been indicated. The third gives us the small, but important, class of apparent exceptions: which now come under notice.

§ 171. *Verbs in which the final Consonant is k or g.* The allied sounds of *k* and *g* (as in *gun*) undergo the same, or nearly the same, changes; and they are numerous.

a. They pass into the sound of *y*. The Anglo-Saxon forms of *lay* and *say* were

Present.	Preterit.	Participle.
<i>Lecge</i>	<i>lægde</i>	<i>ge-lægd</i>
<i>Secge</i>	<i>sægde</i>	<i>ge-sægd</i>
<i>Lay</i>	<i>laid</i>	<i>laid</i> (pronounced <i>lade</i>)
<i>Say</i>	<i>said</i>	<i>said</i> (pronounced <i>sed</i>)

b. Also into that of *h*, originally a guttural *g*. The Anglo-Saxon forms of *seek* were

	Present.	Preterit.	Participle.
	<i>Sece</i>	<i>sohte</i>	<i>ge-soht</i>
Hence	<i>Seek</i>	<i>sought</i>	<i>sought</i>

c. Also into that of *ng*.

	Present.	Preterit.	Participle.
Anglo-Saxon	<i>Bringe</i>	<i>brohte</i>	<i>ge-broht</i>
Modern English	<i>Bring</i>	<i>brought</i>	<i>brought</i>

d. Also into that of *ngk*.

	Infinitive.	Preterit.	Participle.
Anglo-Saxon	<i>þencan</i>	<i>þohte</i>	<i>ge-þoht = think</i>
	<i>þincan</i>	<i>þuhte</i>	<i>ge-þuht = seem</i>

Compare the German *Ich denke*=*I think*; *nich dünkt*=*meseems*.

e. Also into that of *tsh*.

	Present.	Preterit.	Participle.
Anglo-Saxon	<i>Tæce</i>	<i>tæhte</i>	<i>ge-tæht</i>
Modern-English	<i>Teach</i>	<i>taught</i>	<i>taught</i>

Here the Preterit is like that of the preceding instances. The *Present*, however, is changed: the *k* becoming *tsh*.

Catch, caught, caught does not occur in the oldest English. In Layamon we find *caeche, cakhte, caht*. This verb has conformed to the Past Tense of *teach*, &c.—Morris, *Historical Outlines*, &c., p. 171.

Buy. In A. S. *bycge, bohte, ge-boht*.

Work. In Ac. *wyrce*=*I work*: *work-te*=*I worked*; *ge-worht*=*worked*. In addition to the change in the consonant, *r* is transposed. *Beseech*.—The main Verb is *sêc-e*=*I seek*. In English *be-seech, be-sought*. The simple Verb *seek* preserves the *k*. The compound changes it after the manner of *teach*, &c.

Owe—for this see § 179.

PARTICIPLES.

§ 172. *Voice in connection with the Participles*.—Considered from one point of view the Participle is a Noun: considered from another it is a Verb. Now, although so far as Moods, Tenses, and Persons are concerned, we have, in English, no *Voices*, we have them in respect to the Participles. The form in *-ing*, as in *moving*, &c., is a Present Participle in point of Time, but it is Active in the way of *Voice*. The forms in *-en* and *-ed*, as *taken* and *moved*, are Passive in the way of *Voice*, but Past in their character of Participles. There is nothing in the nature of Language that makes this necessary. The Greek Language has its Active and Passive Participle for each Tense; as *τύπτω*=*I beat*, *τύπτων*=*one in the act of beating*; *τυπτόμενος*=*one who is being beaten*; and, for the Passive *Voice*, it has *τύπτομαι*=*I am being beaten*; *τε-τυμμένος*=*one who has been beaten*. In English, however,

there is only one form for each. Hence, though we have no Passive Voice for the Verb Proper, we have both an Active and a Passive Participle—the Active Participle being Present, and the Present Participle Active; whilst the Passive Participle is Past, and *vice versâ*. As it is universally agreed that, whether Perfect or Preterit, the Participles of Past Time are Passive, *Passive* will be the name under which they will be considered. The Active will be considered first. As far as its form goes, this is the most regular one in the English Language; and the rule for it has the merit of being absolutely without an exception. It is not even affected by the laws of Euphony. The sign of the Active, or Present, Participle is *-ing*, which can be added without alteration to every Verb in the language, with the exception of *is, was*.

§ 173. Though all this is clear and simple, the form in *-ing* is one of the most difficult in our language; for it has been, and is at present, doubted whether it be a Participle at all.

There are *four* Parts of Speech with which the termination *-ing* may be connected: the Substantive, the Adjective, the Adverb, and the Participle.

Let us consider, in the first place, its attachment to the Substantive. In expressions like the *blessings of a poor man*; the *wanderings of a traveller*; the *risings (insurrections) of the North*, and others like them, it has a Plural Number.

In *I was going a-hunting, I was a-saying, &c.*, the *a* stands for *on*, and the word *hunting* is in that particular Oblique Case which the Preposition *on* governed. That these combinations are now condemned as provincial, old-fashioned, or colloquial, does not make them bad English. They had, then, when the preposition *on* was prefixed, an Oblique Case; and this, along with its Plural Number, makes the termination Substantival.

As for the word *morn-ing*, it is at the present moment a

Substantive, and nothing else. The Verb *morn*, if it exist at all, is a scarce one.

The original Vowel of these Substantives was *-u*—*clæns-ung*=*cleans-ing*; *hwistlung*=*whistling*. The sign of its oblique case, which was governed by *on*, was *-e*. Hence *Ic was on clænsunge*, &c., *Ic was on hwist-lunge*, was the original of *I was a-cleansing* and *I was a-whistling*; and these were the older forms of *I was whistling* and *I was cleansing*. But these are now called Present Participles.

Taking such a combination as *a-cleansing*, *a-whistling*, *a-hunting*, by itself, and looking at the parsing of it, we may say that in its *Syntax* it is *Adverbial*. It is not, in its origin, an Adverb; but its place in a proposition is that of one.

Such is the history of the old Verbal, or Verbal Abstract, in *-ung*.

If no other word had changed in the same direction, it is probable that nothing would have to be said about it. But the Present Participle in the existing English also ends in *-ing*; as *I am moving*. Moreover the Participle is used as an Adjective; as *a moving (emotional) scene*. Then we have phrases like *a dying day*, which, though it sometimes means *a day that is dying (passing away)*, generally means *a day on which some one dies*; or *a death-bed day*. The construction here is substantival; and still more so is that of *a wedding day*; which certainly very seldom means *a day that is being wedded*.

This brings us round to the previous series, that of the changes of the Verbal Abstracts in *-ung*, to which few would hesitate to assign the word *morning* exclusively, and the words *wedding* and *dying* particularly.

Finally, as the Verbal Abstract in *-ing* began in *-ung*, so did the Participial *-ing* begin in something different from its present form. The older and oldest forms of the Verbs of the Anglo-Saxon middle periods of our language ended in *-nd*.

If this is nothing else, it is the history of two forms originally distinct becoming confluent, interchangeable, or identical; and, what is more, their meanings, however different at first, do the same.

So long as English Grammar is studied on the principles of the Grammars of the Latin and Greek languages only, this complication or parallelism commands but little attention. We know, however, what will happen when it is studied critically. If the combination *I am hunting* be reducible to *I am on hunting*, other so-called Participial constructions may be reduced in the same way—other, and perhaps all.

This view of the nature of the Present Participle, with special reference to its identity (in form) with the Verbal Abstract, was taken by the grammarians of the last generation and their predecessors almost exclusively in reference to its bearing upon our *Syntax*: when the parsing of such a sentence as *what is the meaning of the lady holding up her fan?* was a question of which grammar-reading students might read a good deal. Which was the better English—*lady holding*, or *lady's holding*? And then if we say *lady's holding*, should we not also say *holding up of her fan*? Answer as we may, there are always authorities on the other side. The one point, however, which is certain is that the question, when thus put, is one of *Syntax*.

Within the last forty years, however, its character has changed. It has become mainly a question of Etymology. It has borne less upon the Government and Concord of words like *holding* and *fan* in certain combinations than upon the history of the terminations *-ing* as a form of *-ung*, and *-nd* as the old sign of the Participle. Which does the present form come from? Does it come from one exclusively, or does it sometimes come from the one and sometimes from the other? This suggests a very complicated investigation.

§ 174. *What are the forms ending in -ing?*—Are they Participles or are they Verbal Substantives? A few are

certainly Verbal Substantives: e.g. *morning*. But words of this kind are not numerous. Every Verb, whether old or new, can be the basis of a form in *-ing*; some of them, as *waltzing*, of such late origin that they have come into our language since the prefix *a-* (as *a-hunting*) became obsolete. But these, again, are only a fraction of the whole. What is the rule for the inordinately vast majority wherein the Verbs are from two to nine hundred years old, and which are known to have had undoubted Participles ending in *-nd*, and, in many cases, to have corresponding Verbal Abstracts in *-ung*? What is the general rule for these? Or is there a general rule at all? Are forms of this kind *always* Participles, or are they *never* Participles? The extreme opinions, as is natural, are most in favour of the *-ing* denoting a Verbal. And this is what we expect. A new doctrine is adopted, if adopted at all, with a tendency to extend, rather than to limit, its application. Hence, there is a fair amount of influential authority which goes to the length of implicitly abolishing the Present Participle. But this is an extreme one; for it is clear that, though such combinations as *I am going hunting* may be reduced to *I am a-going a-hunting*, combinations like *a growing tree*, or *a moving crowd*, cannot so be reduced. Still, they may be combinations like *wedding morn* or *dying day*. Now, it is difficult to deny that every one of the so-called Present, or Active, Participles can be so explained. On the other hand, combinations like *early rising is good for the health*, though not inexplicable, are not so easily reduced to Participles.

Presuming then that the rule must be general, we may easily see that a case may be made out strongly in favour of the Participle, as such, having become displaced and superseded by the Verbal Substantive; and the doctrine that it is more likely that the Verbal Substantive should, as a Part of Speech, have displaced the Present Participle, rather than that the termination *-nd* should have been changed into *ng*, becomes, to say the least, plausible.

This shows the real gist of the question. Is it, as a matter of history, a case of forms in *ing*, into which the Participle of the older English has transmuted forms in *-nd*, in the way of letter-change; or is it, as a matter of history, one of the Verbal Substantive in *-ng*, as a Part of Speech displacing, or superseding, the Participle in *-nd*?

It is difficult to form an opinion on this point; so difficult that we must decide that it is one for which *no general rule can be laid down*. And such is the case. We cannot well, even in the most formal and theoretical grammar, abolish the Present, or Active, Participle; whilst to enter upon the individual history of each word, and every difference of meaning with which it may be invested, is impracticable. Few, too, even as a matter of letter-change, now hold that the change from the *-nd* of the Participle to the *-ng* of the Verbal Participle is improbable. On the other hand, the doctrine that the two forms have become what we may call Confluent is recognised; and that Confluence is not an exceptional process in language is, also, recognised. Still, this undoubted Confluence of the Participle and the Verbal is Confluence on a very large scale. Instances of it on a smaller one may be seen elsewhere. (See § 184.)

THE PASSIVE PARTICIPLES IN EN.

§ 175. The Passive Participles are two in number, both indicating Past time. There is no *Present* Participle for the Passive, and there was no *Past* Participle for the Active, Voice; though there is no reason, beyond the practice of the English Language, why there should not be both. The Greeks have *τετυφώς*=*one who has beaten*, as well as *τύπων*=*one who is in the act of beating*. They have also *τυπόμενος*=*one who is being beaten*, as well as *τετύμμενος* and *τυφθείς*=*one who has been beaten*.

§ 176. *The Perfect Passive Participle*.—The sign of the Perfect Passive Participle is *-n* or *-en*. Sometimes the vowel

is that of the Present Tense, as *take*, *taken*. Sometimes it is that of the Perfect, as *stole*, *stolen*. When the Perfect had one vowel for the Singular and another for the Plural, as *Ic swam*, *Wi swummon*, the one which the Participle takes is (as has been already indicated) that of the Plural.

The chief points connected with the Participle that are not involved in the history of the Perfect are—

a. Omission of the final -n or -en.—Sometimes this is wholly obsolete; as in *swum*, *found*, *run*, &c. Sometimes it is obsolescent, or archaic; as *shapen*, *graven*, *gotten* (commonest in compounds, as *forgotten*, *begotten*), *bidden*, *trodden*, &c. Sometimes both forms are equally current, but with a difference of meaning; as *drunk* and *drunken*, *bound* and *bounden*; *he had drunk too much*; *a drunken man*; *we are bound to do it*; *it is our bounden duty*. The *e* in *borne* is a mere artificial expedient for indicating a difference of this kind—*born*=*natus*, *borne*=*latus* in Latin.

b. When the -n, or -en, is thus dropped, the difference between the Participle and the Perfect is reduced; and when the vowel of the two forms is the same it is entirely abolished; in other words the two forms become confluent. The result of this is a great deal of very exceptionable English in admirable and influential writers:

The widows of Ashur are loud in their wail;
And the idols are *broke* in the Temple of Baal;
And the might of the Gentile, *unsmote* by the sword,
Hath melted like snow in the glance of the Lord.

Byron, *Hebrew Melodies*, *The Destruction of the
Army of Sennacherib*.

This is, perhaps, to be excused on the score of its being found in poetry. There is, however, full as much of it in prose.

c. Upon the extent to which the Preterit, as a Tense, has superseded and displaced the Perfect, so much has already been said that it need only be added that the prin-

ciple which applies to the two Tenses applies to the two Participles also; indeed, their histories have been considered together.

When one changes the other generally changes also, though not necessarily at the same time; and it is the Participle which, as a rule, retains its form the longest.

Present.	Perfect.	Participle.
<i>Hew</i>	<i>hewed</i>	<i>hewn</i>
<i>Mow</i>	<i>mowed</i>	<i>mown</i>
<i>Show</i>	<i>showed</i>	<i>shown</i>
<i>Sow</i>	<i>sowed</i>	<i>sown</i>
<i>Melt</i>	<i>melting</i>	<i>molten</i>
<i>Swell</i>	<i>swelled</i>	<i>swollen</i>

d. In A.S., as in the present Dutch and German, the syllable *ge-* was prefixed to both the Participles of Past—as *ge-boren*, *ge-lufod*=*borne*, *loved*. The archaic word *y-clept*=*called*, from the A.S. *clepean*=*call*, still retains it.

§ 177. *Clad*—the Participle of *clothe*.

In the oldest English *clôthian* = *to clothe*; perf. *clâthode*, p. p. *clôthod*. In the thirteenth and following centuries we find *clothien*, *clethen*, *to clothe*; perf. *clethed*, *clothed*, and *clad*, *clad*, p. p. *clôthed*, *clad*.

Clad seems to have arisen out of analogy with such O. E. forms as *ladde*=*led*, *radde*=*read*, *cleth-de*=*cladde*=*clad-de*=*clad*.—Morris, *Historical Outlines*, &c., p. 171.

§ 178. *Sodden*. Two words ending in *th* in A.S. changed it, in the Participle, into *d*.

<i>Cwethe</i>	<i>cwæth</i>	<i>ge-cweden</i>
<i>Seothe</i>	<i>seôth</i>	<i>ge-soden</i>

Seothe changed its vowel in the Plural of the Perfect belonging to the same class as *choose*, *freeze*, and *lose*.

In *writhe* the *th* was retained.

Present.	Perfect S.	Perfect Pl.	Participle.
<i>Writhe</i>	<i>wrâth</i>	<i>wriþon</i>	<i>wriþen</i>

See list in March; Grammar, &c., p. 104.

In *sceathe* the consonant was changed in Tense, but retained in the Participle.

Present.	Perfect S.	Perfect Pl.	Participle.
<i>Sceathe</i>	<i>sceðð</i>	<i>sceððon</i>	<i>sceathen</i>

See list in *March; Grammar, &c.*, p. 107.

§ 179. PRESENT PERFECTS.

A state or an action which, at the time of speaking, is a matter spoken about, is of course *Present*. So far, however, as it has to be done, it is *Future*, and so far as the motive for doing, or the power to do it depends upon antecedent conditions, it is *Past*. Hence, Perfects may become invested with the power of Presents. In Greek we see this in words like *oïda*=*I have experienced or learned which*=*I know*. In Latin *memini*, *I have called to mind*=*I remember*.

In the German languages, words of this kind are something more than mere logical Presents. They serve as formal and fundamental Presents upon which a fresh Past Tense can be founded. This is always a *Preterit*, i.e. never a Perfect. *Can*, *shall*, and *may* are the most notable words of this class. So far as form and origin go, they are Perfects after the manner of *oïda* and *memini*. But they are, also, the bases of such Preterits as *could*, *should*, and *might*; just as if they were Present Tenses, Infinitive Moods, or the word in its original form. There are others beside: though the class is a small one. It falls, however, into two divisions.

I. *Shall*.—Second Person Singular *shal-t*: in Mœso-gothic *skal-t*. Preterit *shoul-d*.

May.—Second Person Singular in Anglo-Saxon, *meaht*: Preterit *meahte*—*meght*. Mœso-gothic *mag-t*.

Can.—Second Person Singular *canst*, in Anglo-Saxon and Modern English. Preterit *cuthe* in Anglo-Saxon, *cou(l)-d* in Modern English, Mœso-gothic *kan-t*.

II. *Owe*.—Anglo-Saxon form *âh*, where the *h* represents

the *g* in the Infinitive *ágan* and the Participle *ágen*. Preterit *áhte*, *ought*.

Dare and *Durst*.—The *s* is part of the root, Greek *θαράσσειν* and *θαράσσειν*. In Mœsogothic it appears in all the persons except the second. 1. *dars*, 2. *dar-t*, 3. *dars*. Pl. *daurs-um*. In A.S. it is 1. *dear*, 2. *dearst*, 3. *dear*. Plural *durr-on*—Preterit *dors-te*—Infinitive *durr-an*.

Must.—In M. G. Pr. Ind. Sing. *môt*, *môst*, *môt*—Pl. *motum*—Pr. *môsta*. *Mote*, when used, had the sense of *may*.

Mind.—In A.S. *ge-man*, *ge-munde*—Inf. *ge-munan*.

§ 180. In these Verbs we have seen a Perfect comport itself, in its character as the theme or basis for a secondary or derivative Tense, like a Present. All the secondary forms we have hitherto seen have been Preterits; or forms by the addition of *t* or *d*. But have we any assurance that they might not have changed their vowel and formed Perfects as well? or have we any assurance that other Verbs might not do so? If so, obsolete Perfects may be revived, though not exactly in the same form. Upon this point I can only quote the following extract. Other Verbs (writes Dr. Murray)

Develop a new strong form, as English *let*, *let*, *let*; Scotch *let*, *luit*, *luiten*; so *sæt*, *suit*, *suiten*; *pyt*, *påt*, *putten*. . . .

This is as old, at least, as the 16th century:—

Thay *lute* the leiges pray to stocks and stanes.

Alexander Scot, *New Year's Gift to Queen Mary*.

Witht in the quilk he *pat* five thousand fut men and horsemen.—*Complaynt of Scotland*, fol. 133, (138) *b*.

I met Gude Counsail be the way,

Quha *pat* me in ane fellon fray.

Lyndsay's *Satyre*, l. 686.

AUXILIARY VERBS.

§ 181. *The root in -s*.—In the inflection of this Verb, which is the same as the Latin *sum*, the forms *am*, *art*, *is*, and *are* are the only ones that have to be considered: the chief question concerning them being the extent to which

they are all forms of the same word, and, when they are shown to be so, how the differences are explained.

The radical letter is *s*; so that the Third Person is the one which in English alone represents the original form. In *ar-t* and *are* it is changed into *r*. In *a-m* it is dropped altogether. *M* and *t* are signs of the first and second persons respectively.

The form *is* is exceptional: for though it is found in the Anglo-Saxon, the Old Saxon form is *is-t*, as it, also, is in the present Dutch and German, and as it is in the Mœsogothic. In the Scandinavian languages the *s* becomes *r*. In Greek the form is *ἐστί* (also *ἐί*).

It is in the Present Tense that this root is most especially found; and in the Past Tenses—whether Perfect or Preterit—that it is most conspicuously absent. It is found in the Infinitive Mood and in the Active, but never in the Passive, Participle. In the Present Indicative it is *always* found, though not always throughout, e.g. in German:—

<i>Io bin</i> = <i>I am</i>	<i>Wir sind</i> = <i>We are</i>
<i>Du bist</i> = <i>Thou art</i>	<i>Ihr seyd</i> = <i>Ye are</i>
<i>Er ist</i> = <i>He is</i>	<i>Sie sind</i> = <i>They are.</i>

Here a second root (*be*) presents itself. In the Imperative and Present Subjunctive this *be* is common.

Like the Personal and Demonstrative Pronouns, the Auxiliary Verbs *am* and *be* are among the oldest words of our languages, indeed of the Indo-European class, in which they are found throughout. This being the case, we are prepared to find that they have undergone more than an ordinary amount of change. That such is the fact we find by an inspection of the Present Tense, where *am*, *is*, and *are* are undoubted forms from the same root. In West-Saxon, however, and in German, the Plural runs *wi*, *ge*, *hi sind* or *sindon*—*wir sind*, *ihr seyd*, *sie sind*; yet these we may hold (truly) are, word for word, the present Plural *are* under another form. Then there are words as unlike as *es*, *sunt*, and *sim* (*sis sit*), and *eram*, &c., all from the same root.

This root is *s* preceded by a Vowel, *i. e.* *as* or *es*, and all the changes it undergoes may be reduced to the four following processes :—

1. The retention or omission of the vowel before *s*—Latin *sum*, for *e-sum*.

2. The changes of *s*- itself—

a. Before the sign of a Person—as *ahmi* in *Zend*, *εἰμι* in Greek=*asm-i* in Sanskrit.

b. Int. *r*-; as in *art* and *are* in English, and *ert* and *er* in Scandinavian.

In Greek *εἰμι*=*sum*=*am* has its *maximum* of Conjugation, and its *minimum* use as an Auxiliary. Indeed, the Persons and the Tenses in that language are so numerous that Auxiliaries can scarcely be said to form a class. Where in Latin it is necessary to say *verberatus sum*, *es*, *est*, &c., we can say in Greek *τέρνυμαι*, *τέρνυσαι*, *τέρνυκται*, &c. The *σ* in Greek, though sometimes rejected, always retains its character as a sibilant, *i. e.*, never becomes *r*.

In Latin, where the Inflections are fewer than in the Greek, the Auxiliary character of *sum*, *es*, *eram*, *esse*, &c. is more decided, and the Conjugation is more defective; inasmuch as in Latin, the root *fu*- plays a conspicuous part. In Latin the *s* becomes *r* in *ero*, *eram*, &c. In Sanskrit, as in Latin, it is defective; the parts which are wanting being made up from the inflection of the root *bh*-, *i. e.* the German *be*, and the Latin *fui*.

In Lithuanic, as in Sanskrit and Latin, the two roots *s*- and *bu*, each in itself defective, are complementary to one another, *i. e.* the inflection of one makes up for what is wanting in that of the other.

The same is the case in the Slavonic.

In German or Gothic, both roots are defective. The extent, however, to which they are complementary to one another is modified by the use, throughout all the languages of the family, of a third auxiliary, viz.—*was*.

§ 182. *Was*.—Of this Verb there are in the present

English four forms: two current, *was* and *were*; and two obsolete or obsolescent, *was-t* and *wer-t*.

Of the three auxiliaries, *was* is the only one which is limited to the languages of the Gothic family.

Like the other two, it is defective; the Present *Indicative* being the Tense from which it is the most conspicuously absent. Professor March gives for this Tense the forms *wese, weseſt, weſep*, adding that they are rare. Dr. Morris gives no instances at all. In the Present Imperative we find *weſ* and *weſaþ*. *Weſan* Infinitive; *wesende* Present Participle; and *ge-wesen*, Perfect, are ordinary forms. Hence the Past Tense then *was*, and the Conjunctive Mood *were*, are the parts to which at present this word is limited in English.

	a.	
<i>I was</i>		<i>We were</i>
<i>Thou waſt</i>		<i>Ye were</i>
<i>He waſ</i>		<i>They were</i>
	b.	
<i>If I were</i>		<i>If we were</i>
<i>If thou were</i>		<i>If ye were</i>
<i>If he were</i>		<i>If they were</i>

In Frisian and Dutch we find the Preterit Participle *ge-weest*.

We have seen that all strong verbs in the oldest English had the suffix *-e* for the second person singular. In the Gothic *was-t* we have an older suffix *t* (suffix of the second person, as in *ar-t*), altogether lost in O. E. (Old English). But *waſt* is not found in the oldest English it is quite a late form, not older than the fourteenth century. The O. E. form was *were* (that is *wese*), from which we have formed, after the analogy of *shall* and *will*, *wer-t*, which is sometimes, but wrongly, used for the subjunctive *were* (second person singular), as '*thou wert grim*' (*King John*, ii. 3).—*Morris, Outlines*, §c., p. 183.

In Mœsogothic the *s* of the Singular and Indicative is retained in the Plural and Subjunctive—as *was, was-t, was; wês-um, wês-uth, wês-un=was, waſt, was, were, &c.; wês-ja-u* (if I) *were; wês-ei-ma* (if we) *were*.

As a Tense *was* is like *can*, and a Perfect rather than a true Present. As such it belongs to that small and peculiar class wherein the vowel is long, the succeeding consonant is a Sibilant, and the *s* or *z* is changed into *r*. Nevertheless, the Gothic, German, Dutch, and English Participles are all formed in *s*. M.G. *wis-ans*, A.S. and German *ge-wes-en*; Dutch *ge-wees-t*.

In the Scandinavian languages, however, the *r* has wholly superseded the *s*.

It is, also, in the Scandinavian languages that *var-* has its greatest importance as an Auxiliary: being used both in the Infinitive and the Participle to the exclusion of *bē*. Still it is excluded from the Present.

§ 183. *Be*, *being*, *been*, are the present forms of the word: in Anglo-Saxon *be*, *beonde*, *yben*—besides which there were two forms for the Second Persons Singular, *bist*, *beest* (used by Milton); and Plural *beoth*. No special form for the Third Person present Indicative, which is always some form of *is*. It is this even in the literary German, where the First and Second Persons are *bin* (*bim*, *beom*) and *bist*—the third being *ist*.

Be, with its *maximum* of inflection, in the German family of languages, has the following forms:—

Infinitive; *beon*, *ben*, *be*.

Present Participle; *beonde*, *being*.

Perfect Participle; *yben*, *been*.

Indicative Present { Singular; 1. *beom*, *bin*; 2. *bist*; 3. *bith*.
Plural; 1. *beoth*; 2. *beoth*; 3. *beoth*.

Imperative Present { Singular; 2. *beo*, *be*.
Plural; 2. *beoth*, *be*.

Conjunctive Present { Singular; 1, 2, 3. *be*, *beo*.
Plural; 1, 2, 3. *beon*.

This tells us that, like *am*, *sum*, *εἰμι*, &c., it formed its First Person Singular in *-m*; so corresponding to the Greek Verbs in *-μι*; also, that it changed the *m* into *n* (German *bin*).

Forms of the Latin *sum* = *esum*.

Sanskrit.	Latin.	Lithuanic.	Bohemian.	Servian.
<i>Asmi</i>	<i>sum</i>	<i>esmi</i>	<i>gsem</i>	<i>yesam</i>
<i>Asi</i>	<i>es</i>	<i>esu</i>	<i>gsy</i>	<i>yesi</i>
<i>Asti</i>	<i>est</i>	<i>esi</i>	<i>gest</i>	<i>yest</i>
<i>Smas</i>	<i>sumus</i>	<i>esme</i>	<i>gsme</i>	<i>yesme</i>
<i>Stha</i>	<i>estis</i>	<i>este</i>	<i>gste</i>	<i>yeste</i>
<i>Sânti</i>	<i>sunt</i>	—	<i>gsau</i>	<i>yesy</i>

Forms of the Greek $\phi\upsilon\mu\iota$.

Sanskrit.	Latin.	Lithuanic.	Bohemian.	Servian.
<i>Bhavâme</i>	<i>fui</i>	<i>buvo</i>	<i>budu</i>	<i>budem</i>
<i>Bavasi</i>	<i>fuisti</i>	<i>buvac</i>	<i>budeš</i>	<i>budesh</i>
<i>Bhavati</i>	<i>fuit</i>	<i>buvo</i>	<i>bude</i>	<i>bude</i>
<i>Bhavamas</i>	<i>fuimus</i>	<i>buvoime</i>	<i>budeme</i>	<i>budemo</i>
<i>Bhavate</i>	<i>fuistis</i>	<i>buvote</i>	<i>budete</i>	<i>budete</i>
<i>Bhavante</i>	<i>fuierunt</i>	—	<i>budau</i>	<i>buti</i>

The Greek is the language in which the root *be* plays the smallest part as an Auxiliary. On the other hand it is the Greek where its character as an independent word is the most manifest. Both as a Verb in μ and as a Baryton, with a regular Conjugation, the word denotes *coming into being, birth, passage from one state to another, development* rather than a Present state of anything that is not going on, or a Past state of any thing that is over and done. $\phi\acute{\upsilon}\omega$ is the Latin *nascor*, and $\phi\acute{\upsilon}\sigma\iota\varsigma$ = *natura*; and with Nature we connect the notion of *growth* or the progress of *becoming something*. The Past Tense, then, in which the root presents itself is the Perfect rather than the Preterit. In the Slavonic it is the Future with which it is most specially connected. It is the Slavonic, too, in which it has its most peculiar functions as an auxiliary.

§ 184. *Defective Verbs.—Quoth.*—The sections upon the two Tenses of Past Time, the Perfect and the Preterit, have shown that in some degree almost every Verb in English is defective. Those that have a Perfect Tense are, as a rule, destitute of a Preterit, and *vice versâ*. This is *defect* on a great scale; and there is defect in many intervening

degrees throughout our language. The present section, however, omits these intermediate instances, and deals with it in the opposite extreme, viz., defect limited to a single Verb; and this is either obsolete or obsolescent.

The Verb, however, is *quoth*. We sometimes say *quoth I*. We never say *quoth thou*. We rarely if ever say *quoth we*, *quoth ye*, or *quoth they*. The Infinitive and Participial forms are unknown. No one living has ever said—to *quoth* or *quothing*.

On the other hand, however, the compound *bequeath* is perfectly regular. To *bequeath*; *bequeathed*, I *bequeathed*, &c. are ordinary Verbs with the usual inflection.

The word *quoth*, then, so far as it is not obsolete, is a signal, typical, or representative instance of Defect in its most limited form.

Nor is it this as a single word only. It impresses its character on the Syntax. We rarely, if ever, say *he quoth*, but *quoth he*; in other words, it is followed by its Pronoun, which in other Verbs, as a rule, comes first.

Add to this that the Pronoun itself is, from a comparatively late period, not given in full, but abbreviated (*quoth-a*), and, to a great extent, incorporated with the main word as a Postpositive Affix.

§ 185. *Confluent Forms*.—In words like the Anglo-Saxon Participle in *-nd* on the one side, and the Abstract Substantives in *-ung* on the other, we had in § 173 forms originally distinct, but which (as the language advanced) were merged into the single form *-ing*. Hence undoubted Participles, like *clænsi-and*, and undoubted substantives, like *clæns-ung*, are, at present, represented by the single termination which gives us *clæns-ing* for both. How ambiguous this form is, we have seen.

When words originally different thus merge into a third form, they may be called *Confluent*; and *Confluence* is a phenomenon which becomes common as languages become recent, or modern. There is not a little of it in the present English. In considering the forms in *-ing* we treated of

Confluence on a large scale. On a smaller scale we have it in certain individual verbs :

(1) *Do, did, done*.—These forms have two meanings, each of which was originally conveyed by a different verb.

Do, in the sense of *perform an act*=the Latin *facio*, had as its Past Tense the reduplicate Perfect *dede*.

Do, in the sense of *be sufficient or suitable*=the Latin *valeo*, had as its Past Tense the Preterit *dohte*.

The root was *dug-* ; Infinitive *dug-an* ; Present *duge* (?) ; Perfect *deāh* ; plural *dugon*.

In German *do*=*facio*, is *thun, thue, thut, ge-than* : while *do*=*valeo* is *taugen, taugede, ge-taught*. From this there is the Substantive *Tugend*=*efficiency, virtue*, and the like. In English we have *doughty*=*strenuous, efficient*.

(2) *Become*.—When this word corresponded with the Latin *fi*, as it does in such expressions as *he became powerful*, the Present was *becommen*, the Perfect *becam*, the Participle *becuman*.

When it corresponded with the Latin *decet*, as it does in *that dress becomes you*, the Present was *becwæmen*, the Preterit *becwæmede*, the Participle *becwæmed*. In the present German they have both the Verb *bequemen*=*to suit, befit*, and the Adjective *bequem*=*suitable, fitting, convenient*.

(3) *Think, thought, thought*.—In the sense of *consider, &c.*=the Latin word *puto* and the A. S. forms were—

þencan, þōhte, ge-þōht.

In the sense of *seem*, as in *me-seems*=*mihi videtur*, and the A. S. forms were

þincan, þāhte, ge-þuht.

The first of these words corresponds with the German *denken* ; as *Ich denke*=*I think* ; the second *dünken* ; as *mich dünkt*—(it) seems to me. So far as being limited to the third Person constitutes an Impersonal Verb *thinks*, when it corresponds to the German *dünkt*, is Impersonal ; for it is

only in the third person that it is found in either language. But it does more than in the way of Impersonality. It has no Nominative Case by which it is preceded. The word *me-thinks*, when analysed and parsed, is *me=mihī* in an oblique case; while *thinks (it) seems*, the Pronoun of the Person being omitted.

§ 186. *Comparison of Adverbs*.—Adverbs form their Degrees of Comparison like Adjectives; so that when we say *the sun shines brighter to-day than it did yesterday*—the word *brighter*=*more brightly* may be the Comparative Degree of either the Adverb or the Adjective; and, as Adjectives may be used Adverbially, there is no proof in the numerous words like *bright*, *soft*, and the whole list of Adjectives, that Adverbs have any *proper* Comparative or Superlative Degrees.

In words, however, like *often-er* and *seldom-er*, there is no doubt as to *often* and *seldom* being Adverbs.

In Anglo-Saxon this Adverbial system of Comparison, in detail, though not in principle, varied with the Part of Speech. The Adjectival forms were *-re* and *-est*, or *-este*; the Adverbial *-or* and *-ost*.

<i>Heard,</i>	<i>heardre,</i>	<i>hardest or heardeste.</i>
<i>Hard,</i>	<i>harder,</i>	<i>hardest.</i>
<i>Heard,</i>	<i>heardor,</i>	<i>hardest, i.e.</i>
<i>Hardly,</i>	<i>more hardly,</i>	<i>most hardly.</i>

§ 187. *Adverbs originating in Cases*.—Of these, *then* and *when*, *then* and *there*, along with *here*, have been already noticed.

Needs—as *I needs must go*.

Else—for *elles*=otherwise.

Once, twice, thrice=*ones, twices, threes*; from Genitives or Possessives.

Seldom, whilom; archaic, from *while*=*time, pause*; from Datives.

Some adverbs thus formed are still in common use, such as *needs*=*of necessity*. Compare the expression in our Prayer Book:

Any ways afflicted or distressed.

Others explain this as a corruption of *wise*.

'Days' is similarly used :

'Tis but early days.—

Troilus and Cressida, iv. 5, 12.

i.e. 'in the day,' as the Germans use '*morgens*.' Compare *now-a-days*.
—*Abbott, Shakesperian Grammar*, p. 35, 1870.

§ 188. *Forms in -ing*.—In such an expression as—

The candle went out and we were left *darkling*.—*King Lear*.

the last word is no participle of the verb *darkle*, even if such a one exist.

Again, in Cowper—

Dick heard; and tweedling, ogling, brideling,
Turning short round, strutting and *sideling*.

the word *sideling* by no means implies the verb *sidle*, though such a verb might easily grow out of it.

That the verb *grovel* has actually grown out of the supposed participle is shown in a masterly monograph by Dr. Morris, to which the reader is referred.

This Adverbial form in *-ling* or *-lung* is common throughout the German family.

Genitive forms—*blindlings*=*blindly*, German, &c.

Dative forms—*darnungo*=*secretly*, Old Saxon; *backlinga*=*backwards*; *nichtinge*=*by night*, Dutch.

In modern English they are rare, and disguised in form—*headlong*, *middling*, and a few others being formations of the same kind as *darkling* and *groveling*.

In Scotch they are common, chiefly with the form *-ins*—*blindlins*, *backlins*, *darklins*, *middlins*, *scantlins*, *stridelins*, *stowlins*. This *-s* extends even to the adverbs in *-ly*.

The Adverbs of Manner, which in English are formed by the termination *-ly*, Ags. *-lice*, O. E. *-liche*, are in Scotch as in most of the Teutonic dialects, identical with the Adjective; thus *a lood synger*, *hey syngs lood*; *nerr duin*, nearly done; *schui can eisie du'd*, she can easily do it. *Guid* is an adjective only, the adverb being *weill*. From adject-

tives in *-lie* we sometimes find adverbs in *-lies*, as if genitive forms, like *once*, *thrice*, *needs*; thus *leyklie*, *leyklies*, *rædilies*, probably; compare *stridlings*, *astride*, *gruvelings* (also *a-gruif*), *prone*, *eäblins*, *eäbles* perhaps, *mæbey*, *mæbeys*, *mayhap*.—Murray, *Dialect of the Southern Counties of Scotland*, p. 226.

In these formations, though the Case is an Oblique one, it must not be supposed to imply a corresponding Nominative. In most of the terminations, *-ng* is like the *-ly* in such words as *man-ly*, Adverbial, or at least Adjectival.

§ 189. This Adverbial use of the Cases of certain Nouns explains those words which, like *toward* and *towards*, *backward* and *backwards*, present them under two forms—one a Genitive; the other either an Accusative or the Dative that has dropped the final *-e*.

PART IV.

SYNTAX.

§ 190. The word *Syntax* is derived from the Greek words *syn* (*with* or *together*) and *taxis* (*arrangement*). It relates to the arrangement or putting together of words. Etymology deals with the forms of single words; Syntax, with the combination of more words than one.

§ 191. The notice of the Compounds of a language leads from Etymology to Syntax; for it is clear that in expressions like *hot-headed* and *horn-blower*, &c., we have something more than an individual word, and, consequently, something which, in some sense, belongs to Syntax. We have *two* words at least. In some cases, as in *midshipman*, &c., we have *three*. We also have them in a state of combination. The combination, however, constitutes but a single word.

It is not always an easy matter to distinguish between two separate words and a Compound; a fact which has already been suggested. A crow is a *black bird*. It is not, however, a *bláckbird*. The best criterion is the accent. When the two words are equally accented, the result is a pair of separate words, connected with one another, according to the rules of Syntax: *the crow is a bláck bírd*. When the two words are *unequally* accented the result is a Compound, as *the bláckbird is akin to the thrush*.

§ 192. In etymology we *decline* and *conjugate*; in syntax we *parse*. Parsing is of two kinds; logical and etymological. Logical parsing gives the analysis of sentences

according to their terms and copulas, telling us which is the subject and which the predicate, which the chief, and which the secondary, parts of each. Etymological parsing gives the analysis of sentences according to the parts of speech of which they are composed. It tells us which is the noun, and which the verb, &c. It separates adjectives from substantives, pronouns from adverbs, and the like. It deals with numbers, cases, persons, &c.

§ 193. Speech chiefly consists of (1) commands, (2) questions, and (3) statements. The combination of words by which these are effected is called a proposition. There are, at least, three kinds of propositions; one to express commands, one questions, and one statements.

Propositions which convey commands are called imperative, as *do this, do not delay, walk.*

Propositions which convey questions are called interrogative, as—*what is this? who are you? Is it here?*

Propositions which convey statements are called declaratory,—as *summer is coming, I am here, this is he.*

Sentences like *may you be happy* are called optative, from the Latin word *opto*=*I wish*. By more than one good authority, they are placed in a class by themselves as a fourth species of proposition. And it cannot be denied that they are expressions of a peculiar character. *Would I could* is also optative, meaning *I wish I could*, or more fully,

*I wish
that
I could.*

Such being the case, we have two propositions conveyed by three words. There is the omission of the conjunction *that*; and (more remarkable) that of the personal pronoun as well.

Sentences like *how well you look!* convey an exclamation of surprise, and have been called exclamatory. Optative propositions are, to a certain extent, imperative, and to a

certain extent declaratory. In *may you be happy*, change the place of *may* and *you*, and the result is an ordinary assertion, *you may be happy*. On the other hand, *you be happy* is a command. There is no command, however, without a real or supposed wish on the part of the speaker.

Exclamatory propositions are, to a certain extent, interrogative, and to a certain extent declaratory. In *how well you look!* change the place of the essential parts, and the result is an ordinary assertion, *you look well*. 'Meanwhile, *how* indicates the degree or extent of your well-looking. But it only *indicates* it. The degree itself is undefined; and (as such) the possible object of a question. *How do you look?* is an actual interrogation. These belong to that part of general syntax which is called Collocation.

Besides being imperative, interrogative, or declaratory, propositions are either affirmative or negative—*Summer is early*—*summer is not early*.

§ 194. In respect to their structure, propositions consist of terms and copulas.

Terms are of two kinds, subjects and predicates.

The subject is the term by which we indicate the person or thing concerning which the statement is made or the question asked. In imperative propositions it denotes the person to whom the command is given. Thus :—*summer is coming—what is this?—make [thou] haste*.

The predicate is the term by which we express what we declare, ask, or command. There is no subject without its corresponding predicate; no predicate without its corresponding subject; and without both a subject and predicate there is no such thing as a proposition. Without propositions there are no questions, commands, or declarations; and without these, there would scarcely be such a thing as language. The little which there would be would consist merely of exclamations like *oh! ah! pish*, &c.

§ 195. The simplest sentences are those which consist of single simple propositions ; as

The sun is shining.
The moon is shining.
The sun is red.
The sun is bright.

Sentences like

The sun and moon are shining ;
The sun and moon are shining bright,

are anything but simple ; for although, when we consider them merely as sentences, they are both short and clear, they each consist of *two* propositions, as will be stated again.

§ 196. The simplest propositions are those that consist of the simplest terms ; as

Fire is burning,
Summer is coming,
Man is mortal,
I am glad,

and the like ; wherein the number of words is three—three and no more ; one for the subject, one for the predicate, and one for the copula.

§ 197. The shortest propositions are not always the simplest. When each word represents either a term or a copula, their grammatical elements coincide accurately with their logical, as was the case with the preceding examples. When, however, these contain fewer than three words, it is clear that either something must be supplied or that a term and copula are combined in the same word ; as is the case with such expressions as

Fire burns,
Summer comes,

where *comes* and *burns* are both predicate and copula at once.

§ 198. The simplest propositions, then, are those that consist of what are called *single-worded* terms. Most terms, however, are *many-worded*. If it were not so, what would

become of those words which, though incapable by themselves of forming a name, are still used for forming a *part* of one—words like *the*, *of*, and the like? Very simple propositions can easily be converted into their opposite; as may be seen by the following operations upon the words

Fire is burning.

1. Prefix the definite article.—*The fire.*
2. Insert an adjective.—*The bright fire.*
3. Add an adverb.—*The very bright fire.*
4. Add a participle, and convert *bright* into its corresponding adverb.—*The very brightly-burning fire.*
5. Introduce a second substantive, showing its relations to the word *fire* by means of a preposition.—*The very brightly-burning fire of wood.*
6. Insert *which* after *fire*, followed by a secondary proposition.—*The very brightly-burning fire which was made this morning of wood.*
7. Add another secondary proposition relating to *wood*.—*The very brightly-burning fire which was made this morning out of the wood which was brought from the country.*
8. Add another secondary proposition by means of a conjunction.—*The very brightly-burning fire which was made this morning out of the wood which was brought from the country, because there was a sale.*

It is clear that processes like this may be carried on *ad infinitum*, so that a sentence of any amount of complexity will be the result. Meanwhile, the predicate may be made as many-worded as the subject. Notwithstanding all this, the primary and fundamental portion of the term is manifestly the word *fire*. To this all the others are subordinate. In like manner, the following lines from the opening of the *Paradise Lost* give us but a single term, of which the word *fruit* is the fundamental element.

The fruit

Of that forbidden tree, whose mortal taste
Brought death into the world, and all our woe,
With loss of Eden; till one greater Man
Restore us, and regain the blissful seat, &c.

§ 199. In declaratory propositions the subject precedes the predicate. We say *fire is hot*, rather than *hot is fire*.

§ 200. In interrogative propositions the predicate

precedes the subject; as *what is this?* rather than *this is what?*

§ 201. In imperative propositions the name of the subject is usually suppressed; e. g. we say, *shut the door*, instead of *shut thou the door*.

PROPOSITIONS IN LOGIC AND IN GRAMMAR.

§ 202. Considerable prominence has been given to the word *Proposition*. Propositions do not form the *whole* of either written or spoken language. Nevertheless, they form the greatest and the most important part of it. Nine hundred and ninety-nine thousandths, at the very least, of the ordinary discourse of Mankind consists in them. Every complete sentence contains one at least; many contain more. Indeed, it is scarcely too much to say that where there is no proposition there is no sentence. A few combinations of words, no doubt, are to be found, which fail to deliver a proposition. They are, however, very few. In the so-called Interjections, words like *oh*, *ah*, *pish*, &c., there is no proposition: neither is there a sentence. In broken and incomplete utterances, there is neither a full sentence nor a proposition; and in the case of the Conjunctions, there is and there is not a proposition. But upon this more will appear in the sequel. At present, it is enough to say, that combinations of words which fail to deliver a proposition are extremely rare. As a general rule, discourse consists of propositions, and of nothing but propositions. *Man is mortal; Summer is pleasant; Winter is cold; Life is short; Art is long; Fire is hot; Iron is useful; Bread is cheap*; to which may be added innumerable others, are all propositions. And it may be added, that they are all propositions of one sort, and that of the simplest. They all contain three words, neither more nor less. They all, too, contain a statement or assertion. In the first, for instance, it is asserted of *man* that he is *mortal*; in the second, it is asserted of *summer* that it is *pleasant*, and so on throughout.

§ 203. Propositions are,* *at least*, of three kinds, (1) Declaratory, (2) Interrogative, and (3) Imperative. Such, indeed, is the view that is taken by the *grammarian*. In treatises, however, upon *Logic*, Declaratory Propositions are the only ones recognized; it being expressly stated that Questions and Commands are incapable of constituting Propositions.

§ 204. However much this may be the case in the Art and Science of Reasoning, it is not the case in the Art and Science of Language. Grammar, as has just been stated, not only recognizes, but peremptorily requires three kinds of Propositions. It should be added, however, that the Declaratory ones are of much the most importance; for which reason they will be taken as the type and sample of the others, and be described in full. The structure of these being understood, that of the others is easy: the parts being the same in all.

§ 205. Propositions are divided according to their *Quality*; as may be seen by adding to the ones under notice the word *not*, and writing *man is not mortal*, *summer is not pleasant*, and so on. This gives us the two classes; one of Affirmatives and one of Negatives. Hence, a Declaratory Proposition is often described as a sentence, in which something is either affirmed or denied.

To say *man—mortal*, *summer—pleasant*, *winter—cold*, *life—short*, &c., is to combine words to no purpose. They form only *parts* of propositions.

Again to say, *—is mortal*, *—is pleasant*, *—is cold*, *—is short*, *—is long*, &c., is to combine words to no purpose. They form only parts of propositions; conveying no meaning, and requiring the addition of something else in order to complete the sense. If a person use them, we ask the questions *what is mortal?* *what is pleasant?* *what is cold?* &c. Something or other must be *mortal*, or *pleasant*,

* Optative and Exclamatory Propositions will but rarely be noticed in the present work.

or *cold*. What this *something* is we wish to know. We wish to know the *something* to which the words *mortal*, *cold*, *warm*, apply.

Again; if we say, *man is—, summer is—, winter is—, life is—, art is—, fire is—, &c.*; or if we say, *man is not—, summer is not—, winter is not—, life is not—, &c.*, we combine words to no purpose. They form only parts, fragments, or rudiments of propositions. We speak, indeed, of *man*, *summer*, &c., but we state nothing concerning them: we say nothing about them. As to whether they are *mortal* or *not mortal*, *cold* or *not cold*, we make no assertion.

§ 206. The object concerning which we make an assertion is called the *Subject*. *Man*, *summer*, *winter*, &c., are Subjects; and we can assert of them that they are *mortal*, or *warm*, or *cold*, &c.; or the contrary.

The assertion made concerning any object, or concerning the subject of our discourse, is called the *Predicate*. *Mortal*, *warm*, *cold*, &c., are Predicates: and we can speak of certain things as *mortal*, *warm*, *cold*, or the contrary.

That part of a proposition which connects the Subject and Predicate is called the *Copula*. If the word *is* stand by itself, the proposition is Affirmative; if it be accompanied by the word *not*, it is Negative.

§ 207. The following words, amongst many others, are capable of forming, by themselves, Subjects:—

man	bow	wealth	ox	pen	atmosphere
mother	fishing-rod	length	ass	ink	firmament
daughter	hunter	fire	bird	virtue	sky
horse	shooter	water	egg	vice	essence
dog	book	soul	winter	apple	truth.

The following words, amongst many others, are capable of forming, by themselves, Predicates:—

good	deep	shooting	hot	fatherlike	moved
great	happy	laughing	cold	bodily	beaten
red	womanly	conquered	strong	essential	sifted
weak	atmospheric	drifted	weak	important	buried.

There are, *at least*, three sorts, or classes of words: (1) those that can, by themselves, form *either* subjects or predicates; (2) those that can, by themselves, form predicates *only*; (3) those that can, by themselves, form copulas. To these must be added a fourth class, consisting of words like *not*, that can convert an affirmative copula into a negative one.

§ 208. The form of proposition which is at once the simplest and the most regular, is that where the number of words and the number of parts coincide; that is, where an affirmative proposition consists of *three* words, and a negative one of *four*. In this case, each part consists of a single word; *e. g.* the subject of one, the predicate of one, the affirmative copula of one, the negative copula of two;—*man is mortal, man is not mortal.*

It is not, however, the usage of language for propositions to take always the simple and regular form exhibited above. Language may be so constructed as to admit of two of the parts of a proposition being included in a single word; and, in reality, most languages are so constructed. Thus—

The copula and predicate may be expressed by a single word. To say *men die*, or *fires burn*, is to make an assertion concerning *men* and *fires*. This assertion is that they *are dying*, or that they *are not dying*; that they *are burning*, or that they *are not burning*. Instead, however, of saying *are dying*, or *are burning*, we say *die*, and *burn*.

The following words, amongst others, are capable of forming, by themselves, both a predicate and a copula, at once:—

eat	teach	shoot	see	sigh	murmur
die	petrify	laugh	hear	hunt	astonish
hunger	impeach	beat	speak	fish	pine.

§ 209. Inasmuch as the copula connects the subject and predicate, it comes between them: *man is mortal*. Hence the copula forms the middle part of a proposition. Conse-

quently, the subject and the predicate form the two limits, boundaries, or extremities of a proposition. Now the Latin word for a *limit*, *boundary*, or *extremity*, is *terminus*. Hence the subject and predicate of a proposition are called, in logical and grammatical language, the *terms* of a proposition. The subject is one *term*, the predicate another.

§ 210. The following list of words indicates a fresh series of facts :—

wisely	then	in	once	for	near	•
justly	to-morrow	over	twice	by	on	
slowly	of	through	thrice	with	about, &c.	

Not one of these words can form a term by itself; that is, not one of them can be either subject, predicate, or copula, so long as it stands alone. No one says *wisely is good*, *from is black*, *man is wisely*.

This, for the present, is sufficient. As we proceed we shall hear of Nouns, Pronouns, Verbs, Adverbs, Prepositions, Conjunctions and Interjections, &c., and the so-called Parts of Speech. When we do this it will be most especially necessary to remember that, in the present English, the Part of Speech to which a word belongs is *determined by the place it takes in the Structure of a Proposition*.

§ 211. *Names and Nouns*.—The word for Noun is, in French, *nom*. It is the Latin *nomen*; which means *name*. Hence, the two words are the same in respect to their derivation. But the word *Name* is a current English word; used by every Englishman who has a name, which means by everybody. *Noun*, on the other hand, is a word used in a limited sense; or mainly, if not exclusively, in Grammar only. This suggests that the two forms may not, in all cases, bear the same meaning; and such is the case. As words of the same origin they are the same. As words of *similar* meaning they are also the same. But, whether they are words of the *same* meaning has now to be considered.

A great deal depends upon this, because the ordinary division of the English and other Grammars runs thus—

Substantives and Adjectives are Nouns ; the former a Noun Substantive, the latter a Noun Adjective ; a classification which implies that they are both *Names*—one as good a name as the other. Then come the *Pronouns*. These are considered not true Names, but substitutes for them. If so, the Adjective is more of a true Noun, and a better *Name*, than the Pronoun.

Again, between the Verb and the Noun, whether Substantive, Adjective, or Pronoun, there is, always, drawn a wide difference.

As for the Participle, it is a Verb in one respect and Adjective in another. But, if so, how comes the difference between the Verb and Noun to be so decided ? for, surely, the Participle graduates into both.

This is manifestly a preface to an objection against this use of the terms.

§ 212. *Names*.—There is more than a million of persons in London, and each of these has a name. There are more than ten thousand towns and villages in England, and each of these has one also. There are more than fifty racehorses at Newmarket, no one of which is without its name.

Of the persons, then, in London, of towns and villages in England, and of the racehorses at Newmarket, every individual has its own designation : *John—Hammersmith—Eclipse*, &c., &c. And as the number of other persons, other towns and villages, and other racehorses, is great, the number of names, in England only, becomes enormous. There is more than a million for the Londoners only. Yet London and Newmarket are only parts of England, and England is only a part of the world in general. Persons, too, and towns, villages, and racehorses are mere fractions of the whole collection of the innumerable somethings, real or imaginary, of the universe. Have all these names ? They have and they have not. They have not names in the way that the persons of London, the towns and

villages of England, and the racehorses of Newmarket have. They have not names like *Thomas*, *Hammersmith*, or *Eclipse*. Nevertheless they have all names. The thousands of *Johns*, *Thomasases*, *Janes*, and *Marys*, that occupy London, are all *persons*, *men*, *women*, *boys*, *girls*, *children*, as the case may be. The numerous *Hammersmiths*, *Londons*, *Newmarkets*, &c., are all *places*, *towns*, *villages*, *hamlets*, &c., as the case may be. The fifty *Eclipses*, &c., at Newmarket, are all *horses*, *mares*, &c., as the case may be. The *Hammersmiths*, &c., constitute part of an indefinite collection of individual places, towns, or villages; the word *place*, *town*, *village*, being names for the class or collection thus constituted. The *Eclipses*, &c., of Newmarket constitute part of an indefinite collection of individual horses, the word *horse* being a name for the classes to which these *Eclipses*, &c., belong. This leads us to a great twofold division of all names whatsoever; names being either *Individual* or *Common*.

§ 213. An *Individual* name is one which denotes a single object and no more. A *Common* name is one which denotes a whole class of objects.

Thomas is a single and particular individual of the class called *man*: *Julius Cæsar*, a single or particular individual of the class called *conquerors*. Or it may be that we look upon him rather as a *hero*. In that case he is an individual of the class of *heroes*. Whether, however, he be a *conqueror*, a *hero*, or a *man*, he is still *Julius Cæsar*; for this is what he is as an individual, irrespective of the particular class under which it may please the speaker to place him, and independent of any class at all.

Examples of this sort may be given *ad infinitum*. The main point, however, to be remarked, remembered, and reflected on, is the following: *Common* names apply to things of which there may be more than one. *Individual* names apply to things of which there is one and no more.

There are many *towns*, but there is only one *London*; many *men*, but only one *Thomas*; many *conquerors*, but only one *Julius Cæsar*.

§ 214. Individual names are also *proper* names, and there are many good writers who habitually call them so, preferring the term *proper* to either *singular* or *individual*. The reason for this lies in the fact of individual names being *appropriated* or made *proper* to certain single individual objects to which they are exclusively attached.

§ 215. Common names are also called *general*; and there is no objection to the term. It is possible, indeed, that it may be the better one of the two.

§ 216. Individual names are essentially *singular*, and it is as common as well as true statement, that no *individual name can be plural*. A grammarian would say that no *proper name can be plural*. How, then, can we use such expressions as *both the Bostons are important sea-ports*, or, *as long as Mæcænases abound Maros will be plentiful*—*Sint Mæcænates non deerunt, Flacce, Marones*?

The *Boston* in Lincolnshire is a different town from the *Boston* in Massachusetts; so, though the same combination of sounds or letters applies to both, it cannot be said that the same *name* is so applied. The same name is one thing; the same word applied to different objects is another. A name is only so far individual as it applies to some individual object. The two *Bostons*, however, are different objects.

The case of *Mæcænas* and *Virgil* is different. Here there are but two individuals; one *Mæcænas*, and one *Virgil*. But the famous *Mæcænas* is something more than the particular patron of *Virgil*. He is the sample, type, or representative of *patrons in general*. *Virgil*, in like manner, is something more than the particular poet patronized by *Mæcænas*. He stands for *poets in general*. Hence, the meaning of the Latin line, and of the English sentence that preceded it, is this:—*As long as there are men like Mæcænas, there will also*

be men like Virgil. But a man like Mæcenas is a patron, and a man like Virgil a poet. Hence—*As long as there are patrons there will be poets also.*

§ 217. We now come to four new terms, that mutually illustrate each other. They run in pairs: (1 and 2), *Substance* and *Attribute*; (3 and 4), *Abstract* and *Concrete*.

Take (for instance) an orange. It strikes our senses. We see with our *eyes* that it is more or less round, *i. e.* that it is endowed with the *property or quality of roundness*. We see, too, that it is more or less *yellow*, *i. e.* that it is endowed with the *property or quality of yellowness*. We see that it is more or less *smooth*, *i. e.* endowed with the *property or quality of smoothness*. Our eyes tell us all this; the sight being the sense by which our belief as to the properties in question is conveyed to us. They tell a great deal more; but this it is unnecessary to enlarge on.

Then comes the evidence of our other senses.

By our *ears*, we detect a sound if we rub the skin with our fingers.

We *smell* it and find a peculiar and not unpleasant *aroma*.

We *taste* it and are gratified with a not unpleasant *flavour*.

We *feel* that it is elastic, or endowed with the attribute of elasticity. We feel, too, that it has a certain figure and size. We feel, too, that it has a certain weight.

On the strength of all this we say that an orange is *round, yellow, smooth, capable of exciting sounds, fragrant, sapid, elastic, &c.*

When we say that an orange is this, we *attribute* to it certain properties, or qualities. What are they? The qualities, or properties, of *roundness, yellowness, smoothness, sonorousness, fragrancy, sapidity*.

And how do we speak when we say that we do so? It is convenient to begin with saying how we *do not* speak. We *do not* say that an orange *has the property of round,*

yellow, smooth, &c. On the contrary, we say that it has the property of *round-ness, yellow-ness, smooth-ness, &c.*

So much for the attributes of an *orange*; at least, for some of them. The attributes of a *guinea, a loaf, a man, a fish*, or anything else, may be considered in the same way. They are, of course, when taken altogether, different from those of an orange. The principle, however, of considering them is the same.

Let us now suppose that all these attributes are, one by one, taken away, *and replaced by others*; that instead of an orange striking our eyes and sense of touch as round, it strikes them as square, or rhomboid; that it loses its fragrance and becomes fetid; that it sounds like a bell, and tastes like a loaf of bread. Would the object still be an orange? Would it not be something else? This leads to the question of the *essential* attributes or *essences* of things. We need not mind them for the present; but may turn our thoughts in a somewhat different direction.

Divest the orange of all its attributes *without supplying it with new ones*. What will it be then? Take away its original colour without replacing it by any fresh one. Let it lose its softness without becoming hard, its roundness without becoming of any other form. Annihilate its weight, taste, and smell. Let it have no means of appealing to eye, ear, taste, smell, or touch, so that it become, at one and the same time, impalpable, invisible, imperceptible. What will it be then? Will it be anything at all?

What becomes of the attributes? We have seen that they were taken away. What was done with them? They were taken away *separately*, and it is *separately* that they are put aside. *Roundness and yellowness* no longer go together. Each is in its own place; and that is a place by itself. No link now unites them; the orange in which they met being no more.

But we may unite them afresh; say in the idea of a golden ball, a guinea, a full moon, &c. And we may, also,

separate them, again and again. United, they give the idea of an object clear, palpable, sensible. Separated, or abstracted from those objects, they do nothing of the kind. Yet the mind takes cognizance of them. The idea of the particular attribute of yellowness, abstracted from an orange, is not much more difficult than the idea of the orange *minus* the attribute of yellowness. It is merely a case of difference and remainder; the additions and subtractions being made unconsciously and instinctively.

What becomes of the orange? Is it annihilated by the abstraction of its attributes, one and all? Few are prepared to say *yes* to that question. Few divest themselves of the notion that sensible, and material, objects are nothing more than the combination of certain properties, qualities, and attributes, each and all of which may be removed in such a way as to leave an absolute nothing. We rather imagine that, where there are certain attributes in union, there is a certain link which connects them; a basis, or foundation, which supports them; a basis or foundation different from the attributes themselves, but upon which they rest.

This *something* supports them. This something stands *under* them. This something is the *sub-stance*, or *understanding*, of objects opposed to, and contrasted with, their *attributes*. Now Concrete terms are the names of Substances; whilst Abstract terms are the names of Attributes; *e. g.* :—

ABSTRACT.

Brightness,
Heat,
Light, &c.
Mortality,
Vitality,
Animality,
Solidity,
Resistance, &c.
Fluidity, &c.

are Attributes of the
Substances

CONCRETE.

Sun.
Fire.
Spark.
Animal.
Man.
Horse.
Wood.
Stone.
Water.

		<i>Vice Versâ.</i>		
CONCRETE.	}	are Substances with the Attributes	{	ABSTRACT.
<i>The Sun,</i>				<i>Brightness.</i>
<i>Moon,</i>				<i>Heat.</i>
<i>Stars, &c.</i>				<i>Warmth.</i>
<i>Man,</i>				<i>Mortality.</i>
<i>Horse, &c.</i>				<i>Animality.</i>

§ 218. *Variable and Invariable Names.*—Besides being either Proper or Common, and Abstract or Concrete, names are Invariable or Variable.

Words like *stone*, *tree*, *man*, &c., denote certain objects which constitute a class including an indefinite number of individuals. To any of these the name may apply; but we cannot apply it to an object belonging to a different class. It is nonsense to call a *tree* a *stone*, or a *stone* a *tree*. Each name applies to the individuals of a certain group, and, as it cannot be applied otherwise, it is an *invariable* name.

All names, however, are not invariable. The word *I*, for instance, is *variable*. It changes its meaning with the person speaking. When William says *I*, it means William; when John says *I*, it means John. So, again, with *you*—it denotes the person to whom I happen to be speaking at the moment; but the next moment I may alter its meaning by speaking to some one else. The same applies to *that*, *this*, *these*, and several other words.

If a *mother* say *I*, it means a *mother* and a *female*; if a *father* say *I*, it means a *father* and a *male*. Even if an inanimate object be personified and be supposed to speak about itself and to say *I*, it means that inanimate object. It denotes the speaker, whoever he may be; but it is not the invariable name of any speaker whatever. Or, it denotes the object spoken of, whatever it may be; but it is not the invariable name of any object whatever. The word *this* means a *table*, when the speaker is talking of *tables*; a *dog*, when he is talking of *dogs*, &c.

§ 219. *Relational and Notional Names.*—Why are Pro-

nouns *Variable*? The answer to this lies in the meaning of the word *Attribute*. An Attribute, as we have seen, is some property that we separate, or *abstract*, from a substance. It may be a permanent or inherent one, like the weight, colour, or form of a material object; or it may be a fundamental or characteristic one, like the power of growth in a vegetable or an animal. But it may, also, be one which has no fixed or permanent character whatever; and may apply to an object only so far as it is in a certain relation to the speaker, or to something spoken about. Thus the word *I*, by which Thomas calls himself when he is speaking to John, means Thomas only so long as Thomas speaks of himself. When he is addressed by John, he is addressed as *thou* or *you*; and, so long as John addresses him, that is his name. It is, of course, his name only so long as John uses it; but it is his name *for the time being*. When Thomas addresses John, the two names change their application, and *I* means Thomas, *thou* John. Again, when, with two oranges lying before me at different distances, I call one *this* and the other *that*, the meaning, import, or application of the two words is reversed when I change their places. Still, they are names *for the time being*.

Now names of this kind depend on the *Relations* of the objects to which they apply; and as *Relations* change, the import of the name changes with them. Hence, they are *Variable* in respect to their application, and *Pronominal* as Parts of Speech.

The permanent *Attributes* of an object are called its *Qualities*. As names they are called *Notional*, as Parts of Speech they are *Substantival*.

Number is a Relation rather than a Quality; and hence the Numerals are Pronouns.

The Pronouns of which the Relations are the most direct and definite are those of the First and Second Person—*I*, *thou*; *we*, *ye*.

The next in order are the Demonstratives, *this* and *that*;

of which the Pronoun of the *Third* Person is merely an applied variety. When we get into the class of the Adjectival Pronouns, the direct character of the Relation is greatly reduced. The word *same* denotes identity; but the name of the object with which the identity is connected may, itself, require explanation: e.g. A. *This is the same as the other.* B. *But what is the other?* A. *The same as that (or this).* Still the fundamental attribute is a Relation.

§ 220. PARTS OF SPEECH.

The Syntax of a language is always regulated by its Etymology; so that in those languages where the etymological details are numerous, the rules of syntax are also numerous. On the other hand, where the etymology is simple, the syntax is of moderate dimensions.

In English, as has been seen, our etymological forms are few. The adjective is wholly destitute of them: yet it is a part of speech which, in many languages, has at least two genders—often three. In French, for instance, we say *le bon père*=*the good father*; but *la bonne mère*=*the good mother*. In Latin *bonus pater*=*good father*; *bona mater*=*good mother*; *bonum telum*=*good weapon*. Meanwhile, the plural runs *boni patres*, *bonæ matres*, *bona tela*. The Frenchman who said *bon mère* or *bonne père* might be accused of making a false concord; inasmuch as he would join an adjective in one gender to a substantive in another. No Englishman can possibly commit an error of this kind; because in the word *good* there is no change at all, and because, in English, we say *good father*, *good mother*, *good thing*, *good fathers*, *good mothers*, and *good things* indifferently.

The same applies to the articles. In French there are the forms *un* and *une*=*a* (or *an*); along with *le*, *la*, *les*, meaning *the*. Meanwhile, the German says *der*, *die*, *das*, *einer*, *eine*, *eines*, where the Englishman says simply *the* and *a* (or *an*). Of course, then, the details of the syntax of the article must be simpler in English than in German.

This, however, will be shown in detail as we proceed; since the points which the previous remarks suggest are that, as the outward and visible signs of concord, government, &c., are, to a great extent, wanting, the place that a word takes in the structure of propositions is of more than ordinary importance.

Some parts of speech can form terms by themselves. Others can only form *parts* of terms. This distinction should be attended to.

§ 221. *Details.*—The pronoun and the substantive.

The pronoun and the substantive can, *by themselves*, form *either* the subject or the predicate. They are both *names*. But the pronoun is a *convertible*, the substantive an *inconvertible* one.

The adjective and the participle can, *by themselves*, form the predicate of a proposition. The participle differs from the adjective in implying a corresponding verb.

The *finite* verb (for the verb in the infinitive mood is a noun rather than a verb) can form *both* the predicate and the copula.

The adverb can form no term by itself, but can, when associated with a verb, a participle, or an adjective, form *part of one*.

The preposition can form no term by itself; neither can it without *two* terms capable of doing so. It connects the two by *government*.

The conjunction can form no term by itself, neither can it (with a few exceptions) enter *into* a proposition at all. Its presence implies two propositions *between* which it finds place, and which it either connects or disconnects.

The affirmative and negative words *yes* and *no* can, *by themselves*, constitute a proposition. But they always imply, and depend upon, a previous one.

Have you done this? *Yes*.

Have you done this? *No*.

The interjection neither forms nor enters into a proposition.

The article, in respect to its *origin*, is a pronoun; a *numeral* in the case of *an* or *a*; a *demonstrative* in the case of *the*. As an element in the structure of a proposition it must be looked upon as a part of its noun rather than as an independent word. In some languages it actually coalesces with it and forms part of its declension; and in others it coalesces with the proposition which precedes the noun.

§ 222. *The concords*.—Concord is derived from the Latin word *concordia*, and signifies *agreement*.

The word *man* is the name of a male, and, in respect to its gender, is masculine. The word *she* relates to a female, and, in respect to its gender, is feminine. We do not, when speaking of the same person, say I saw the man and *she* saw me; or I saw *him* and *she* saw me. If we do, there is a *discordance* in the matter of gender. On the other,

I saw him and he saw me,
I saw her and she saw me,

are concords; and, as there are more kinds of concords than one, this is called the concord of *gender*.

The other concords will be noticed in their details as we proceed. But a general view of their nature and numbers may be given now.

If I say *I saw these man*, or *I saw this men*, there is a discord. *This man* and these *men* are the true combinations. This gives us a concord of *number*.

If I say *he is him*, there is a discord of case. The true combination is *he is he*. This gives us a concord of *case*.

If I say *I speaks*, there is a discord. What I ought to say is *I speak*. This gives us a concord of *person*. This is peculiar to the verb. So is *we speaks*, which gives us a discord of number; but this has been already noticed under the noun.

If I say *I do this that I might gain by it*, or *I did this that I might gain by it*, this is a *discord*. The right expression is either *I did this that I might gain by it*, or *I do this that I may gain by it*. This gives us a concord of *tense*. This is not generally recognized as a concord; but it

evidently is one. The recognized concords are four in number; *the* four concords—*i.e.* those of gender, number, case, and person; the latter being limited to the verb, which, on the other hand, has no concord of gender.

There is another kind of concord, which, from having a special and conspicuous name of its own, has not been classed among THE FOUR recognized concords—*viz.* Apposition—which see under Compound Sentences.

§ 223. *Apposition*.—In expressions like *George, King of England*, we must notice—

1. That the words *King* and *George* are in the same case.
2. That they denote the same object. The word *George* applied to that particular monarch means the same person as the *King of England*; and the words *King of England* applied to the same monarch mean the same person as *George*.
3. That they explain each other. If we say simply the *King of England*, we do not sufficiently explain ourselves; since we may mean a *Henry*, an *Edward*, or a *William*. And if we say simply *George*, we do not sufficiently explain ourselves; since we may mean any person in the world whose name is *George*. But if we say *George, King of England*, we explain what *king* and what *George* is meant.

Words that thus explain each other, mean the same thing, and are in the same case, may be said to be *placed alongside of each other*, or to be in *apposition*. The Latin word *appositio* means *putting by the side of*. The following are specimens of apposition:—*Solomon, the son of David*.—*Cræsus, King of Lydia*.—*Content, the source of happiness*.—*John's the farmer's wife*.—*Oliver's the spy's evidence*.—*Cæsar, the Roman emperor, invades Britain*.—Here the words *Roman emperor* explain, or define, the word *Cæsar*; and the sentence, filled up, might stand, *Cæsar, that is, the Roman emperor, &c.* Again, the words *Roman emperor* might be wholly ejected; or, if not ejected, they might be thrown into a parenthesis. The practical bearing of this fact is exhibited

by changing the form of the sentence, and inserting the conjunction *and*. In this case, instead of one person, two are spoken of, and the verb *invades* must be changed from the singular to the plural. Now the words *Roman emperor* are said to be in apposition to *Cæsar*. They constitute, not an additional idea, but an explanation of the original one. They are, as it were, *laid alongside* (*appositi*) of the word *Cæsar*. Cases of doubtful number, wherein two substantives precede a verb, and wherein it is uncertain whether the verb should be singular or plural, are decided by determining whether the substantives be in apposition or the contrary. No matter how many nouns there may be, so long as it can be shown that they are in apposition, the verb is in the singular number, provided that the main noun is also singular. There is still another concord; but it must be put into logical rather than grammatical phraseology. It is that the *predicate must agree in case* with its subject. It was noticed in § 219.

§ 224. *Government*.—So much for the concords, or for concord in general. It means what its name denotes, *agreement* in certain points between any two words of which number, gender, &c., have been the chief. The effect of all concords is to keep such words in the same grammatical place as they were.

The opposite to concord is *government*, or *regimen*. This puts each word out of two in a *different* place. Thus in *I strike him*, while *I* is in the nominative case, and *strike* in the corresponding person, *him* is in the objective case, and, so being, agrees with neither of them.

The chief forms of government are:

1. Government of a noun by a noun, as *the father's son*.
2. Government of a noun by a verb, as *I strike him*.
3. Government of a noun by a preposition, as *the father of the son*; *speak to me*.
4. Government of a verb by a conjunction or a relative pronoun, *e.g.* :

He strikes me; as opposed to *if he strike me, I shall strike again*.

The man who did this shall die, whoever he be. This is generally considered more correct grammar than *the man who did this shall die*, whosoever he is.

§ 225. *Caution*.—A great deal of government in the way of grammar is done by the *verb*; and as a general rule, the verb *governs* an objective case. But it is only the *transitive* verb that does so. Still, the transitive verbs are the chief members of their class. Hence the ordinary government of the transitive verb has been identified with that of the verbs in general; and as the transitive verbs govern their noun in the objective case, any instance of any other case being governed by a verb has been treated as exceptional. Whether it is so or not is a matter, *practically*, of small importance, because, in English, all the cases of *substantives*, except the possessive, end alike. Hence, the rule that verbs govern an objective case has been made to imply more than is legitimate. It puts all the cases with the exception of the nominative on the same level. Yet we know that even the possessive case had originally certain verbs that governed it—*he weold middangeardes*=*dominatus est terræ*.

There is confusion here, but it is not this particular form of confusion we are guarding against. The notion that the verb *governs* has unduly extended itself. The verbs *be* and *am* are known as substantive verbs; and it has not only been admitted, but it has been specially taught, that the verbs substantive *govern* a nominative case. Sometimes it is stated in a more general way, that they are followed by the case by which they were preceded. The fact is true enough, but what the reader is especially cautioned against is that the result is not a case of *government* at all. When Milton wrote

If thou beest *he*, &c. &c.,

he would have been wrong in writing

If thou beest *him*.

But the rule which (had he done so) would have been violated is a rule of concord, *not* of government. It is a rule of concord, and a very general one. It is the rule that the *Pre-dicate agrees in case with the Subject*.

§ 226. *Collocation*.

The order or arrangement of the words of a sentence is in English a matter of more than ordinary importance; and it is easy to see why it should be so. In languages, like the Latin, where the inflections are numerous, words like *bonus dominus* or *pulchra filia* may be placed far apart from one another, and so may words like *milites pugnans*, or *pueri ludite*, and thousands of others in similar circumstances. This is because in the terminations *-us*, *-a*, we have certain outward and visible signs of gender, and these show that the words in which they occur agree with one another in that respect. And the same is the case with *-es*, *-i*, *-nt*, and *-ite*, except that the agreement here is in the way of number, and it is number of which these syllables are the signs. But in English, where the adjectives have no signs of anything at all, or, in other words, no inflection, while the remaining parts of speech have but few, no such latitude is admissible. Hence, words which agree with one another must, as a general rule, be kept in one another's neighbourhood.

§ 227. Such are the three chief heads under which the great majority of the rules of syntax may be arranged. There are none of them of an abstruse character; indeed, the class of concords is so thoroughly a matter of common sense that, at the first view, it seems scarcely worth explanation; for it is clear enough that in the concords of number, gender, case, and person, the two words in agreement are really two names of the same object, and such being the case, *must*, in both cases, be of the same gender, number, and the like. This is so simple a matter, that, at the first view, it appears that we want no grammarian to enlarge upon it.

§ 228. Such would, doubtless, be the case if the concords, &c., stood alone, *i.e.* if there was nothing to disturb them.

But this is not the case. The following is a notice, not of all, but only of some of these disturbing influences. They are well known and generally recognised. They have been, to some extent, classified, and some of them have names—old names dating back to the classical time of Greek language; and thus showing that they have belonged to grammar ever since it was first cultivated.

§ 229. *Ellipsis*.—Such a name is *Ellipsis*, signifying ‘omission,’ ‘deficiency,’ or ‘falling short,’ or ‘short coming.’

This was bought at *Rundell and Bridge’s*, i.e. shop, warehouse, or place of business. I am going to *St. Paul’s*, i.e. cathedral.

§ 230. *Pleonasm*.—Such a name is *Pleonasm*, signifying excess.

The king *he* is just.

The men *they* were there.

I saw *her*, the queen.

The king *his* crown.

In the comparative degree we occasionally find, even in good writers, besides the syllable *-er*, the word *more*; as, *the more serene spirit*. Expressions like these are pleonastic, since the word *more* is a superfluity.

In the superlative degree we occasionally find, even in good writers, besides the syllable *-est*, the word *most*; as, *the most straitest sect*. Expressions like these are pleonastic, since the word *most* is a superfluity.

§ 231. *Personification*.—Such a name is *Personification*, of which the following are instances :

Gold, whose touch seductive leads to crime.

The cities who aspired to liberty.

The unexceptionable forms for these two texts are : 1. *gold, the touch of which*, &c. ; 2. *the cities which aspired*, &c.

Still the exceptionable texts can be explained, perhaps excused. We may say that a *city* is what it is on the strength of human individuals that constitute it; and we say *Gold* is treated as a personal agent, like *Sin*, *Death*, *Virtue* and *Vice*, &c.

§ 232. *Violations (real or apparent) of the concord of number*.—*I have not travelled this twenty years*.—*As this is*

singular, and *twenty years* plural, there is an apparent violation of the concord of number. Still, it is only apparent. The words *twenty years* may be considered to mean, not *twenty separate years taken severally*, but *a number of years amounting to twenty dealt with as a single period*. In this latter case the words *twenty years*, though plural in form, are singular in sense.

These sort of people.—Here *these* is plural, and *sort* is singular: so that there is a violation (real or apparent) of the concord of number. Still, as the word *sort* implies the existence of more persons than one, the expression is open to the same kind of explanation as the preceding one.

The reason of this confusion of number is clear. There are in all languages certain substantives called Collectives. Of these collectives the word *sixpence* is a good example. It involves two notions: (1) that of *six separate pennies*; (2) that of *six pennies dealt with as a single sum*. In the first case it is plural; since in talking of *six separate pennies* we contemplate a plurality of parts. In the second case it is singular, since in talking of *a single sum* we lose sight of the plurality of parts, and contemplate only the unity of sum that results from them. In all collective substantives there is a mixture of two notions. *Army, parliament, people, mob, gang, set, family, &c.* are collectives.

By remembering that in all languages there is a tendency to *personify*, we can explain many apparent violations of the concord of gender.

By remembering that in all languages there is a certain number of *collective* substantives, we can explain many apparent violations of the concord of * gender.

§ 233. The special details of English syntax now come under notice. They will be arranged according to the several parts of speech. As has been already stated, the place which a word takes in a proposition will determine its place as a

* For *Attraction*, which belongs to the Syntax of Compound Sentences, see § 280, note.

part of speech. As a preliminary, however, we must divide propositions into two classes: (1) simple propositions; (2) complex, or compound, propositions.

SIMPLE PROPOSITIONS.

ARTICLES.

§ 234. In the generality of grammars, the definite article *the*, and the indefinite article *an*, are usually the very first parts of speech that are considered. This is exceptionable. So far are they from being essential to language, that, in many dialects, they are wholly wanting. In Latin the words *filius patris* mean equally *the son of the father*, *a son of a father*, *a son of the father*, or *the son of a father*. But, though the Latin language has no article, each and all of the languages derived from it have one. The French has the article *le*=*the*, and *un*=*one*. So have the Italian, the Spanish, &c. But the Wallachian is the most remarkable. In Wallachian, or Moldavian, the article *follows* the noun to which it belongs. It also coalesces with it, so that the two form one word. Thus if *om*=*man*, the combination *om-ul*=*the man*. In this case it is *post-positive*, or placed after the substantive. This post-position is, by no means, rare. Neither is its amalgamation with the substantive. What occurs in the Wallachian occurs in the Icelandic also. So it does in the Danish, Swedish, Norwegian, and Feroic, derived from it. All this suggests the likelihood of the article being one of those parts of speech which originate during the later rather than the earlier stages of language. It also suggests a manner in which a part of speech, originally non-existent in a language, may be developed. If the Latin be the mother-tongue of the French, &c., and these contain articles, how came those articles there? Though wanting in the old Roman, the materials out of which they might be developed were present. The Latin had the word *unus*=*one*. It had also the words *ille*, *illa*=*he* and *she*. Now the French *un*

=*a=unus*; the indefinite article having grown out of the numeral. And the French *le=ille*; the definite article having grown out of the demonstrative pronoun. Neither was the French process of evolution or development peculiar. The articles of *all* the allied languages arose out of *unus* and *ille*; and, *mutatis mutandis*, the origin of the articles in the languages allied to our own is the same. What is *the* but a word of the same origin with the demonstrative *th-is* or *tha-t*? What is *a* but *an*; and *an* but *án* or *ane*, and *án* or *ane* but *one*? The article, then, in respect to its *history* is a pronoun, but, in respect to its *syntax*, it is a part of speech by itself. This is because it cannot, like the pronoun, form a term. The article is *incapable of existing, except in conjunction with either a substantive or some other pronoun*.

§ 235. The articles in English are *the*, *an*, *no*, and *every*. More than one competent writer has already suggested that *no* is an article. If so, it must, of course, be considered as different in its construction from the ordinary negative. It has no independent existence. It *has* an existence when coupled with a substantive or another pronoun. It=*not one*, and *none*, in power. The construction of *every* is exactly the construction of *no*. We can say *every man* as we can say *no man*, and *every one* as we can say *no one*; but we cannot say *every* and *no* alone.

§ 236. When two or more substantives, following each other, denote the same object, the article precedes the first only. Thus—we say, *the secretary and treasurer*, when the two offices are held by one person. When two or more substantives following each other denote different objects, the article is repeated, and precedes each. We say *the* (or *a*) *secretary and the* (or *a*) *treasurer*, when the two offices are held by different persons. This rule is much neglected.

§ 237. Before a consonant, *an* becomes *a*; as *an axe*, *a man*. In *adder*, which is properly *nadder*, and in *nag*, which is properly *ag*, there is a *misdivision* (*a nag* for *an ag*, *an adder* for *a nadder*). So, also, in the old glossaries.

<i>Hec auris</i>	a nere	i. e. an ear.
<i>hec aquila</i>	a neggle	— an eagle.
<i>hec anguilla</i>	a nele	— an eel.
<i>hec erinaceus</i>	a nurchon	— an urchin.
<i>hic comes</i>	a nerle	— an earl.
<i>hic senior</i>	a nald man	— an old man.
<i>hic exul</i>	a nowtlay	— an outlaw.
<i>hic lutricius</i>	a notyre	— an otter.
<i>hec alba</i>	a nawbe	— an aube.
<i>hec amictus</i>	a namyt	— an amice.
<i>hec securis</i>	a nax	— an axe.
<i>hec axis</i>	a naxyltre	— an axletree.
<i>hec ancora</i>	a nankyre	— an anchor.

NUMERALS.

§ 238. The numeral *one* is naturally singular. All the rest are naturally plural. Nevertheless such expressions—*one two* (= *one collection of two*); *two threes* (= *two collections of three*), are legitimate. They are so because the sense of the word is changed. We may talk of several *ones* just as we may talk of several *aces*; and of *one two* just as of *one pair*.

§ 239. Expressions like the *thousandth-and-first* are incorrect. They mean neither one thing nor another: 1001st being expressed by *the thousand-and-first*, and 1000th + 1st being expressed by *the thousandth and the first*. In words of this kind the construction is that of *the king-of-Saxony's army*.

§ 240. It is by no means a matter of indifference whether we say the *two first* or the *first two*. The captains of two different classes at school should be called the *two first boys*. The first and second boys of the same class should be called the *first two boys*.

PRONOUNS.

§ 241. A Pronoun is a convertible name which can, by itself, form either the subject or the predicate of a proposi-

tion. It agrees with the substantive in this respect, but differs from it in being convertible.

I am he.

This is the man.

What is that?

We have seen that as the Pronouns have the fuller inflection, they preceded both the substantive and the adjective when we treated of their etymology. For the same reason they come before them in syntax. Whether we say *feed the horse* or *the horse feeds* is indifferent; inasmuch as, in *substantives* like *horse*, there is no difference between the objective and nominative. Whether we say *a good book* or *good books* is indifferent; inasmuch as, in *adjectives* like *good*, there is no difference between the plural and the singular. Whether we say *feed he* or *feed him* is by no means indifferent; inasmuch as, in *pronouns* like *he*, &c., the objective and the nominative cases differ in form.

Whether we say *this book* or *these books* is by no means indifferent, inasmuch as in *pronouns* like *this*, &c., the plural and the singular numbers differ in form.

§ 242. *You and ye*.—As far as the present English is concerned *you* is a nominative form and *ye* is obsolete. The following passages show that, at one time, the two forms were nearly changing place.

As I have made *ye* one, Lords, one remain,

So I go stronger, *you* more honour gain.—*Henry VIII.* 2.

What gain *you* by forbidding it to teaze *ye*?

It now can neither trouble you nor please *ye*.—*Dryden*.

§ 243. *Pronomen reverentiæ*.—When we say *you* instead of *thou*, it is doubtful whether, in strict language, this is a point of grammar. I imagine that instead of addressing the person we speak to as a single individual, and applying to him a plural pronoun, we treat him as a collection of persons. If so, the practice is other than grammatical. We treat one person as more than one. There is, evidently, some courtesy in this; inasmuch as the practice is very

general. The Germans change, not only the number, but the person, and say (*e. g.*) *sprechen sie Deutsch*=*they speak German* ? rather than either *sprichst du* (*speakest thou*), or *sprechet Ihr* (*speak ye*).

§ 244. *Dativus ethicus*.—In the phrase

Rob me the exchequer.—*Henry IV.*

the *me* is expletive, and is equivalent to *for me*. This is conveniently called the *dativus ethicus*. It occurs more frequently in the Latin than in the English, and more frequently in the Greek than in the Latin.

§ 245. *The reflected personal pronoun*.—In the English language there is no equivalent to the Latin *se*, the German *sich*, and the Scandinavian *sik*, or *sig*; from which it follows that the word *self* is used to a greater extent than would otherwise be the case. *I strike me* is awkward, but not ambiguous. *Thou strikest thee* is awkward, but not ambiguous. *He strikes him* is ambiguous; inasmuch as *him* may mean either the *person who strikes* or some one else. In order to be clear we add the word *self* when the idea is reflective. *He strikes himself* is, at once, idiomatic, and unequivocal. So it is with the plural persons. *We strike us* is awkward, but not ambiguous. *Ye strike you* is the same. *They strike them* is ambiguous. Hence, as a general rule, whenever we use a verb reflectively, we use the word *self* also. The exceptions to this rule are either poetical expressions or imperative moods.

He sat *him* down at a pillar's base.
Sit *thee* down.

§ 246. *Reflective neuters*.—In *I strike me*, the verb *strike* is transitive. In *I fear me*, the verb *fear* is intransitive or neuter; unless indeed *fear* mean *terrify*—which it does not. Here, after a neuter or intransitive verb, the reflective pronoun appears out of place, or as an expletive.

The system of the syntax of the Reflective Pronouns thus formed is developed in different degrees in the diffe-

rent Gothic languages; but in all more than in the English.

Sometimes the construction is equivocal. The place of the reflective is *after* the verb. The place of the governing pronoun is, in the indicative or subjunctive moods, *before* the verb. Hence in expressions like the preceding there is no doubt as to the power of the pronoun. The imperative mood, however, sometimes presents a complication. Here the governing person may *follow* the verb; so that *mount ye*=either *be mounted* or *mount yourselves*. In phrases, then, like this, and in phrases

*Busk ye, busk ye, my bonny, bonny bride,
Busk ye, busk ye, my winsome marrow,*

the construction is ambiguous. *Ye* may either be a nominative case governing the verb *busk*, or an accusative case governed by it=*yourself*.

The words *his* and *her* are possessive cases, and *not* adjectives; being equivalent to

*Mater ejus, not mater sua.
Pater ejus, not pater suus.*

§ 247. In expressions like *they say*, &c., *they* means *the world at large* or *people in general*. This is the indeterminate use of the pronoun. *One says* is also an indeterminate expression.

It is also indeterminate. It stands for an unexpressed, but understood, *subject*.

Closely connected with the indeterminate sense of *it* is that of *there*, in such expressions as *there is something wrong*—*there is no one here*—*there are thieves in the house*. In such expressions *there* stands for an unexpressed, but understood, *predicate*.

In such phrases as *it rains*, *it snows*, *it freezes*, it would be hard to say, in express terms, what *it* stands for. Suppose we are asked *what rains?* *what snows?* *what freezes?*

—the answer is difficult. We might say *the rain, the weather, the sky*, or what not? Yet, none of these answers are satisfactory. To say *the rain rains, the sky rains, &c.*, sounds strange. Yet we all know the meaning of the expression—obscure as it may be in its details. We all know that the word *it* is essential to the sentence; and that if we omitted it and simply said *rains*, the grammar would be faulty. We also know that it is the subject of the proposition.

A curious way of giving precision to this indefinite power of the word *it* is seen in the following list:—

Pluit	.	.	raynes	.	.	Deus meus.
Gelat	.	.	freses	.	.	„ tuus.
Degelat	.	.	thowes	.	.	„ suus.
Ningit	.	.	snawes	.	.	„ ipsius.
Tonat	.	.	thoners	.	.	„ sanctus.
Grandinat	.	.	hayles	.	.	„ omnipotens.
Fulgurat	.	.	lownes	.	.	„ Creator.

Instead of the true nominative *ye*, we use (with few exceptions) the objective case *you*; as *you speak, you two are speaking*. In this case we substitute one case for another.

Instead of the true pronoun of the second person singular, *thou*, we use (with few exceptions) the pronoun of the second person plural, *ye*; and that in the objective rather than the nominative case, *you speak=thou speakest*.

There are very few languages where the pronoun of the second person singular is used, except in solemn discourse. Sometimes that of the second person plural, sometimes that of the third person plural, serves as its substitute.

§ 248. The words *my, thy, his, her, its, our, your, their*, in respect to their syntax or construction to a great extent, are *cases*, in the same way that the word *father's* is a case. They are this to a great extent, but not wholly.

The words *mine, thine, ours, yours, hers, theirs*, are adjectives, in the same way that *good* is an adjective.

If the words *his, her, and its* were not *cases*, such expres-

sions as *his mother*, *her father*, would violate the concord of gender; since *his* is masculine, whilst *mother* is feminine; *her* feminine, whilst *father* is masculine.

* *This is a discovery of Sir Isaac Newton's* is different in sense from *this is a discovery of Sir Isaac Newton*. The latter means *this is how Sir Isaac Newton was discovered*: the former means *of Sir Isaac Newton's discoveries this is one*.

In all such sentences there are *two* substantives: one with which the article agrees, and which is expressed; and one by which the possessive case *s* is governed, and which is omitted, as being understood.

The pronominal possessive cases, *my*, *thy*, &c., are not in *all* respects like the possessive cases of the substantives (*father's*, *mother's*, &c.)

We cannot say *an enemy of my* —, *a notion of thy* —, &c. Yet—

We can say *these are good books*, but we cannot, *now*, say *these are mine books*. Hence—

Rule 1.—The adjectival pronouns like *mine*, *thine*, *ours*, &c., are only used when the substantive is *understood*; as *this book is mine*, *i. e.* *my book*.

Rule 2.—The possessive cases are only used when the substantive is *expressed*; as *this is my book* (not *this is mine book*, nor yet *this book is my*).

§ 249. *Construction of the word self in composition with pronouns*.—1. In the words *my-self*, *thy-self*, *our-selves*, *your-selves*, the word *self* (or *selves*) governs the words *my*, *thy*, *our*, *your*, just as in the expression *John's hat* the word *hat* governs the word *John's*; so that *my*, *thy*, are possessive cases.

2. This is not the case with the words *him-self* and *them-selves*. Here the words *self* and *selves* are in apposition with the words *him* and *them* respectively.

3. The word *her-self* is ambiguous; since it is doubtful whether *her* be a possessive or an objective case.

4. The word *it-self* is also, sometimes, ambiguous ; since it is doubtful whether it originated in *it-self* or *its-self*.

This inconsistency in the use of the word *self* in composition dates from the earliest stage of our language.

§ 250. The indeterminate pronouns are admirably illustrated by researches into the history of the language. The word *one* in the expression *one says* has nothing to do with the numeral *one*. The numeral *one* was, in Anglo-Saxon, *áne*, and in Latin *unus*. But the indeterminate *one* had no existence in Anglo-Saxon at all ; and it was foreign to the soil of England until the battle of Hastings. Hence, common as it is, it is of French origin. The older forms in French were *om* and *homme*, which are neither more nor less than the Latin *homo*=*man*. So that *one says*=*man says* or *men say*. Now this is what our Anglo-Saxon ancestors actually said. Before *on* was introduced from France we said *man* or *men*. At the present time the German for *one says* (*on dit*) is *man sagt*. In West-Saxon we find *me*.

SUBSTANTIVES.

§ 251. A substantive is an *inconvertible* name, which can, by *itself*, form either the subject or the predicate of a proposition.

Summer is coming.

This is *gold*.

Gold is *metal*.

It differs from the pronoun in its *inconvertibility*.

It differs, too, from the pronoun in its declension, which is simpler. The substantive has only *three* signs of case and number ; and, besides this, all the three signs that it has are identical in form—to the *ear*, though not to the *eye*.

The ship's sail.

The ships are sailing.

The ships' sails.

Its syntax from the want of cases is simple. For phrases like *Rundell and Bridge's*, *St. Paul's*, see § 229.

Government of the substantive.—When one governs, or determines the case of another, the noun which is governed is in the possessive case—as the *man's hat*, the *father's son*, the *master's house*.

The order of the words thus governing and governed by each other gives us almost the only rule without an exception in the English language. The possessive case or the case of the noun governed always precedes, and never follows, the case that governs it. Attention is called to this not only on account of the generality of the rule, but because in the allied language of Germany no such regularity exists. The Germans say *Geschichte Roms* = *History of Rome*.

The meanings of a *man's hat*, &c., and the *hat of a man*, are so closely allied that the preposition *of* has been called the sign of a genitive case. It is not the sign of a case at all; but the *substitute* for one.

§ 252. *The Case Absolute.*—It is only from the possessive case that the nominative is distinguishable. It is the same in form as the objective, at least for the *substantive*. In the pronoun there is a difference.

This leads to a question often raised, and perhaps even now not finally answered. In sentences like the following,

The *door* being *open*, the steed was stolen.

The *sun* having *arisen*, the labourers began to work.

In what case are *door* and *sun*, *open* and *arisen*?

To answer this we must frame a similar sentence, and in it substitute a pronoun for the substantive; for, as the pronoun has *two* cases, it will help us to decide the question.

1. *He made the best proverbs of any one, him only excepted.*

2. *He made the best proverbs of any one, he only excepted.*

Which of these two expressions is correct? This we can decide only by determining in what case nouns standing absolutely in the way that *door*, *sun*, and *him*, (or *he*) now stand, were found in that stage of our language when the

nominative and objective cases were distinguished by separate forms.

In Anglo-Saxon this case was the *dative*; as *up-asprungenne sunnan*=*the sun having arisen*.

In A. S., also, *him* was a dative case, so that the case out of which expressions like the ones in question originated, was dative. Hence of the two phrases, *him excepted*, and *he excepted*, the former is the one which is *historically* correct.

It is also the form which is *logically* correct. Almost all absolute expressions of this kind have reference, more or less direct, to the *cause* of the action denoted. In sentences like *the stable door being open, the horse was stolen*,—*the sun having arisen, the labourers got up to work*, this idea of either a cause, or a coincidence like a cause, is pretty clear.

Now the practice of language in general teaches us this, *viz.* that where there is no proper instrumental case expressive of cause or agency, the ablative is the case that generally supplies its place, and where there is no ablative, the dative. Hence the Latins had their ablative, the Anglo-Saxons their dative absolute. The genitive absolute in Greek is explicable upon other principles.

In spite, however, both of history and logic, the so-called authorities are in favour of the use of the nominative case in the absolute construction.

THE ADJECTIVE.

§ 253. An Adjective is a word which can, *by itself*, form the Predicate of a Proposition, but not the Subject.

Fire is *warm*,
but not
Warm is *fire*.

When such an arrangement as the latter occurs (and it does occur in the well-known text, *Great is Diana of the Ephesians*), we have not only the formation of a Subject by the

Adjective, but a transposition of the Predicate. The Adjective is wholly destitute of Inflections ; so that its Syntax is simple in proportion to their paucity.

§ 254. The Adjective generally precedes the Substantive ; as a *good man*, not a *man good*. In many other languages the order is reversed. Even in English we may use such expressions as *a man just and good*, *a woman wise and fair*, *a hero devoted to his country*.

§ 255. When two objects are compared, the Comparative, when more than two, the Superlative Degree, should be used—*this is the better of the two*, but *this is the best of all*.

§ 256. The Positive preceded by the word *more* may stand instead of the Comparative. We may say *more wise*, instead of *wiser*.

The Positive preceded by the word *most* may stand instead of the Superlative. We may say *most wise* instead of *wisest*.

§ 257. That they can be used is universally known. Neither is there anything remarkable in their syntax. Common sense tells us what they mean. When, however, do we use the one form, when the other ? This depends upon the nature of the Adjective. In general terms, we may say that the object of the circumlocution is to keep the length of the word within certain limits. It is, *probably*, better to say *more fruitful* than *fruitfuller*. It is *certainly* better to say *more pusillanimous* than *pusillanimouser*. But it is doubtful whether this is the only rule to go by. A great many Adjectives (*fruitful* amongst the number) are Compounds, in which case the addition of an *extra* syllable presents an accumulation of subordinate parts, which, to some speakers, may be inconvenient or disagreeable. Thirdly, there is a large number of Adjectives which are of foreign origin. To some of these an English affix *-er* or *-est* would be exceptionable.

§ 258. Thus much, however, may safely be said—

1. That when the word is, at one and the same time,

monosyllabic and English in origin, the forms in *-er* and *-est* are preferable.

2. That when the word is trisyllabic, compound, and of foreign origin, the combinations in *more* and *most* are to be resorted to.

For intermediate cases the writer may consult his own taste. Of dissyllables, the words that end in *-y* are those that, next to our native monosyllables, have the best claim to be inflected—as *holy*, *holier*, *holiest*—*manly*, *manlier*, *manliest*; upon which we may remark, by the way, that they are all Anglo-Saxon.

§ 259. The adjective *like* governs a case, and it is, at present, the only adjective that does so. When we say this is *good for John*; the government proceeds not from the adjective *good*, but from the preposition *for*. The word *like*, however, really governs a case.

VERBS (*Finite*).

§ 260. A *Finite Verb* is a word which can form, by itself, both the Predicate and the Copula of a Proposition, as *Fire burns*.

The Concords of the Finite Verb are those of Number and Person, in Simple Propositions. In Complex Propositions there is a third Concord; that of Mood.

§ 261. *Persons*.—In Latin, and certain other languages, the Pronoun is omitted, it being enough to say—

<i>Voco,</i>	<i>I call.</i>		<i>Vocamus,</i>	<i>We call.</i>
<i>Vocas,</i>	<i>Thou callest.</i>		<i>Vocatis,</i>	<i>Ye call.</i>
<i>Vocat,</i>	<i>He calls.</i>		<i>Vocant,</i>	<i>They call.</i>

In English, however, except in three small classes of words, the subject is always expressed. We cannot say *speakest*, however much the termination *-est* may suffice to show that the word is in the second person. On the contrary, *thou speakest* is the form that must be used.

The three cases where the subject may be omitted are

(1) that of the Imperative Mood, (2) that of the Optative Preterit, and (3) that of the three Impersonals.

In Imperative Propositions, the subject, being the name of the person spoken to, is suppressed without either ambiguity or inconvenience. We may say, *walk thou—hold thou thy tongue*: but we may also say, *walk—hold thy tongue*.

The Preterit *would*, when Optative, or expressive of a wish, can stand by itself, i.e. without any personal pronoun to precede it. We may say, *I would I could*: but we may also say, *would I could*.

The three Impersonals are (1) *Methinks*, (2) *Meseems*, (3) *Me listeth*.

In Anglo-Saxon *þincan* signified *think*, whilst *þencan* meant *seem*. Hence, *methinks* and *meseems* mean the same, viz. *it seems, or appears, to me*. Here *me* is in the condition of the Dative Case, and *it* is suppressed or understood. *Me listeth* means *it pleases me*.

The Personal Pronoun generally precedes the Verb. Expressions like *said I*, or *says he*, instead of, *I said*, or *he said*, are only admitted in very familiar discourse. One verb, however, *always* precedes its pronoun, viz. *quoth*—we always say *quoth he*: never *he quoth*.

The Pronoun of the Second Person is only used in solemn discourse, and by members of the Society of Friends. Instead of *thou speak-est*, we say *you speak*.

§ 262. *Government of Verbs*.—Verbs are of two sorts: (1) Transitive, (2) Intransitive.

In saying *I strike the iron*, the verb *strike* denotes an action. It also does something more: it denotes an action that has an effect upon an object; since the word *iron* is the name of an object, and the word *strike* is the name of an action that affects that object. In this case the action may be said to *pass off* from the agent (i.e. *the person who strikes*) to the object (i.e. *the iron*). Verbs expressing action capable of affecting objects are called Transitive Verbs, from the Latin word *transire*=*to pass over*.

In saying *I walk*, the verb *walk* denotes an action. It does not, however, denote an action that has any effect upon any object whatever. The action alone, in its simplest form, is stated to take place. Verbs like *walk* are called *Intransitive*, because *no* action can be said to pass off from them to any object.

Respecting the Government of these two sorts of verbs, there are the two following rules:—

1. Transitive verbs always govern the substantive in the objective case; as *I strike him, he strikes me, they teach us, the man leads the horse, &c.*

2. Intransitive verbs govern no case at all; as *I sleep, I walk, I think, &c.*

The same word has often two meanings, one of which is transitive, and the other intransitive; as, 1. *I move*,—where the verb is intransitive, and denotes the mere act of motion. 2. *I move my limbs*,—where the verb is transitive, and where the action affects a certain object (*my limbs*); or, 1. *I walk*,—where the verb is intransitive, and denotes the mere act of walking. 2. *I walk the horse*,—where the words *I walk* are equivalent to *I cause to walk*, and are also transitive, denoting an action affecting a certain object (*the horse*).

Unless this fact of the same verb having transitive and intransitive meanings be borne in mind, transitive verbs will appear to be without an objective case, and intransitive verbs to govern one.

SYNTAX OF THE PARTICIPLE.

§ 263. This follows that of the *Adjective* and *Verb*; for the Participle partakes of the character of both.

A Participle, like an Adjective, is wholly destitute of actual inflection.

A Participle, however, like an Adjective, must be considered in respect to its *virtual* Cases, *virtual* Numbers, and *virtual* Genders.

The Past Participle combines with both *am* and *have*, as *I am called, I have spoken*.

§ 264. When preceded by *have*, the Participle is in the Accusative Case and the Neuter Gender. This is explained by what follows.

In phrases like *I have spoken, I have slept, I have moved, I have written*, the verb *have* is in the present tense, whilst *spoken, slept, moved, written*, are past passive participles. Here *have* indicates past time. It indicates past time, even although it be itself in the present tense.

As, however, the natural meaning of the word denotes *possession*, it may naturally be asked how it comes to mean *past time*. To say *I own written a letter, I possess written a letter, I hold written a letter*, sounds as nonsense; at any rate, it gives no such a meaning as is given by the words *I have written a letter*. Nevertheless, it is very evident that, in order for a person to possess an object, the object must be in existence. We cannot say that a man *owns, possesses, or holds, a written letter*, without also implying that a *letter has been written*.

Now comes the notice of the construction. The participle *written* has the same form for all cases, genders, and numbers; and this conceals the fact of its following the case, gender, and number of the substantive with which it is connected. Add to this the circumstance that the participle has in the present English a peculiar position in the sentence. If we said, *I have a horse ridden*, we should connect the fact of past time with the idea of *possession*, much more clearly than we do in the current phrase, *I have ridden a horse*. The proofs that the view above is the true one are as follows:—

1. In certain languages we find other words besides *have*, expressive of possession, used for the sake of denoting past time: e. g. in Spanish the word *tengo*=*I hold*, and in Old High German and Old Saxon the word *eigan*=*to own*. In these tongues, phrases like *I hold ridden, I own ridden*=*I have ridden*, are actually existing.

2. In Old High German, Old Saxon, and Anglo-Saxon, we have the order of the participle and substantive occasionally reversed; *e. g.* instead of saying *I have forgotten it, I have chosen him, I have made one*; the phrases run, *I have it forgotten, I have him chosen, I have one made.*

3. In languages where there is a sufficient amount of inflection to exhibit the participle as agreeing in case, number, and gender with the substantive to which it applies, such agreement is exhibited. In the Latin of the Middle Ages we find expressions like *literam scriptam habeo*=*I have a written letter, or I have written a letter.*

§ 265. In *I have ridden a horse, and I have ridden a mare*, the word *ridden*, although *horse* is masculine, and *mare* is feminine, is in the same gender. Moreover, the word *ridden* is in the neuter gender, and, as such, equally different in gender from the two substantives *horse* and *mare*.

Apparently this violates the statement made above, *viz.*, that the participle agrees with the noun in case, number, and gender. In reality it does not. Sentences like the one in question are elliptical, the word *thing* being understood: so that *I have written a letter* is equivalent to *I possess a letter as a written thing*. *I have ridden a horse* is equivalent to *I possess a horse as a ridden thing*. *I have ridden a mare* is equivalent to *I possess a mare as a ridden thing*.

Hence it is not with the substantive that appears in the sentence, but with the substantive *thing* understood, that the participle agrees. As such it is in the neuter gender.

§ 266. *Syntax of the Verb Substantive in the Present Tense with the Past Participle.*—The Participles *moved, beaten, struck, given*, are Participles of a past tense. Hence, *I am moved* should mean, not *I am in the act of being moved*, but *I am a person who has been moved*;—*he is beaten* should mean, not *he is a person who is in the act of suffering a beating*, but *one who has suffered a beating*: in other words the sense of the combination should be *past*, and not *present*. By a comparison between the English and Latin languages

this anomaly becomes very apparent. The Latin word *motus* is exactly equivalent to the English word *moved*. Each is a Participle of the passive voice, and of the past tense. Besides this, *sum* in Latin equals *I am* in English. Yet, the Latin phrase *motus sum* is equivalent, not to the English combination *I am moved*, but to the combination *I have been moved*; i. e. it has a past and not a present sense. In Greek the difference is plainer still, because in Greek there are two Participles Passive, one for the present, and another for the past tense; e. g. *τυπτόμενος εἰμι* (*typtomēnos eimi*)=*I am one in the act of undergoing a beating*; *τετυμμένος εἰμι*=*I am one who has undergone a beating*. The reason for this confusion in English lies in the absence of a passive form for the present. In Mæso-Gothic there existed the forms *slahada*=*he is beaten* (*percutitur, τύπτεται*) and *slahanda*=*they are beaten* (*percutiuntur, τύπτονται*), &c. Now, as long as there was a proper form for the present, like those in Mæso-Gothic, the combinations of the present tense of the Verb Substantive with the Participle Past Passive had the same sense as in Latin and Greek; that is, it indicated past time: e. g. *ga-bundan-s im*=*I have been bound* (not *I am bound*), *gibans ist*=*he has been given* (not *is given*), &c. When the passive form, however, was lost, the combination took the sense of a present tense.

Adverbs.—§ 267. Take three words, e. g. *summer is pleasant*. Prefix any such word as *cheerfully*, *warmly*, *brightly*, *mildly*. Ask what sort of sense is made by the combination. The answer will be, that, whether we say *cheerfully summer is pleasant*, or *summer cheerfully is pleasant*, we can only get a meaning by taking the word *cheerfully* along with the word *pleasant*; in other words, that, although we may talk of *cheerful summer*, we cannot talk of *cheerfully summer*.

1. In the first place, they cannot form by themselves the subjects of propositions; since we cannot say, *cheerfully is pleasant*, or *cheerfully is summer*.

2. Neither can they form by themselves the predicates of propositions ; since we cannot say *summer is cheerfully*.

3. Nor yet can they form the copulas of propositions : since we cannot say *summer cheerfully pleasant*.

4. Nor yet can they form the copula and predicate at once : we cannot say *summer cheerfully* in the way we say *summer cheers*.

Speaking generally, they cannot constitute *by themselves* any of the parts of a proposition.

Although, however, they cannot do this, they can combine with certain words which *can* constitute some of the parts of a proposition, and so form subordinate parts of subjects and predicates.

The class of words with which words like *cheerfully* combine are the Adjectives. We can say *summer is cheerfully pleasant, summer is ardently hot, man is certainly mortal, John is tolerably good, James is exceedingly bad, this is enormously big, that is contemptibly little, &c.*

They also combine with the Participles ; as *he is hunting eagerly, we are fishing earnestly, they are shooting continually, the sun is shining brightly, the wife is weeping immoderately, &c.*

Every verb contains a Participle. Now, words like *cheerfully* can combine with Verbs. This they do on the strength of the Participle involved—*John eats heartily, James drinks deeply, he speaks loudly, she breathes difficultly, he lives piously, he died calmly, he fears exceedingly, &c.* As it is generally with the Verb that words like *cheerfully* are combined, they are called *Adverbs*.

An Adverb, then, is a word that can enter into the proposition only when combined with an Adjective, a Participle, or a Verb ; as—*Man is certainly mortal, John is certainly riding, John certainly rides*. The following words, along with many others, are Adverbs :—

once	never	badly
now	yet	much
then	here	brightly, &c.

§ 268. In expressions like *the sun shines bright*, the word *bright*, an Adjective, is equivalent in meaning to the Adverb *brightly*. In English there is, with Adjectives, no distinction of gender; if there were, *bright*, and words like it (used adverbially), would be neuters.

Adjectives in the Neuter Gender are, above all other parts of speech, used in an adverbial sense, and that not only in English, but in most other languages.

§ 269. Adverbs are susceptible of the degrees of comparison. This takes place in three manners:—

1. By adding *-er*, or *-est*, to the Adverb; as *bright-ly*, *bright-li-er*, *bright-li-est*; *tight-ly*, *tight-li-er*, *tight-li-est*.

2. By taking the comparative or superlative form of an Adjective, and using it adverbially; as *the sun shines brighter to-day than it did yesterday*, and *probably it will shine brightest to-morrow*.

3. By prefixing the word *more*; as *the sun shines more brightly than it did yesterday*, and *will probably shine most brightly to-morrow*.

Of these three methods of denoting the degrees of comparison of Adverbs, the last is most used by the best authorities.

Prepositions.—§ 270. Besides the Adverbs, there is another class of words that can enter into the construction of a proposition only when combined with others. Take the word *to* or *from*, and deal with it in the way that the Adverb *cheerfully* was dealt with.

We cannot make it the subject of a proposition. We cannot say *to is summer*, or *from is summer*.

Neither can we make it the predicate of a proposition. We cannot say *summer is to* or *summer is from*.

Nor yet can it become a copula. We cannot say *summer to pleasant*, *summer from pleasant*.

Just as little can either *to* or *from* form copula and predicate at once. We cannot say *summer to*, *summer from*, in the same way that we say *summer cheers*.

In order to admit words like *to* or *from* into a proposition, we must combine them with other words.

Now, words like *to* and *from* will not combine with the same parts of speech as words like *cheerfully* combine with.

1. They will not combine with Adjectives. We cannot say, *summer is from pleasant, summer is to hot.*

2. They will not combine with Participles. We cannot say, *he is hunting from, they are shooting to.*

3. They will not combine with Verbs. We cannot say, *he comes from, he drinks to.*

The class of words with which words like *to* and *from* will combine are the Substantives and Pronouns. We can say, *he comes from London, he comes from the country, he drinks to me, she drinks to him, &c.*

All words like *to* and *from* require a Substantive or a Pronoun to be combined with them.

§ 271. In many languages, where a word like *to* and *from* is combined with a Substantive or Pronoun, the word like *to* and *from* comes first; whilst the Substantive or Pronoun follows after; as *he comes from London*, not *he comes London from*.

Owing to the fact of words like *to* and *from*, when combined with a substantive or pronoun, coming, in many languages, first, they are called *Prepositions*, from the Latin words *præ* (*before*) and *positus* (*placed*), or words *placed first*. In languages where they *follow* the substantive or pronoun, the term preposition is somewhat inapplicable.

A preposition is a word that can enter into a proposition only when combined with a substantive or pronoun; as

John is going to London.

James is coming from London.

The following words, along with several others, are prepositions—*in, on, of, at, up, by, to, for, from, till, with, through.*

§ 272. Every preposition governs a case ; that is, every preposition is followed by a substantive or a pronoun in some case or other.

COMPLEX SENTENCES.

§ 273. *Syntax of Complex Sentences.*—Sentences consisting of two propositions are called complex. They always contain either a relative pronoun or a conjunction—(1) *The sun which shines to-day will shine to-morrow*, (2) *the sun shines, and therefore the day will be fine*.

§ 274. *Relative Pronouns.*—Sometimes the structure of complex sentences is simple. This is the case when the second proposition follows the first, and the two stand apart from each other, in such a way as to be easily separated. If I say *the man is coming who brings the letters*, we know exactly where one proposition ends, and where the other begins. We find, too, that the analysis of the expression is of the easiest. We see that *the man is coming* constitutes one proposition ; *who brings the letters*, another. We see that the two actions are denoted, (1) the act of *coming* ; (2) the act of *letter-carrying*. We see, too, that, although there are two actions, there is but one agent ; for the man *who comes* and the man *who carries the letters* are the same person. Such being the case, the word *who* means *the man*, and *relates* to it ; whilst the word *man* explains what is meant by *who*, and *goes before* it as an *antecedent* ; for in Latin, *ante*=*before*, and *cedo*=*go* ; so that *ante-cedent* is *that which goes before*. All this is clear, and may be made clearer by writing the two propositions separately : as

The man is coming ;
Who brings the letters.

Here, the separation of the two propositions is complete ; so complete, that we may, if we choose, consider that they form two distinct sentences.

To show that *who* means *the man*, we may, if we please, write

The man is coming,
He brings the letters.

Or,

The man is coming,
The man brings the letters.

The result is the same. There are two actions and one agent. Instead, however, of naming the agent twice, we use a word that *relates* to him.

All this is clear. Nevertheless, it is well known that although complex sentences, like the one just given, are easily constructed, they are, by no means, very common in the actual course of language; wherein few persons keep the two propositions separate. On the contrary, they blend them together, and say *the man who brings the letters is coming*. This, although it adds a little to the complexity, ought not to create a difficulty. A little consideration tells us that we may say

1. The man is coming; the man brings the letters; *or*,
2. The man is coming; he brings the letters; *or*,
3. The man is coming; who brings the letters; *or*,
4. The man [who brings the letters] is coming.

The Relative here means the same as the Antecedent, and is only the Antecedent under another form.

§ 275. The Relative and the Antecedent are, of necessity, in the same Gender.

The Relative and Antecedent are, of necessity, in the same Number.

These rules are universal; for they apply not only to the English language, but to all others. Such being the case, their importance becomes manifest. Such, too, being the case, it may be well to devote some time and attention to obtaining a clear view of them. Every Relative has its Antecedent, and every Antecedent its Relative. A Rela-

tive without an Antecedent, or an Antecedent without a Relative, is impossible. The one, indeed, is necessary to the other; so that the words belong to the same class as *father* and *son*, *husband* and *wife*, *ruler* and *subject*, and the like. There would be no such thing as *husbands* if it were not for the *wives*. There would be no such things as *rulers* if it were not for the *subjects over whom they rule*, and *vice versâ*. In like manner, an Antecedent without a Relative is no Antecedent at all, and a Relative without an Antecedent is a contradiction in terms.

As the Relative is the Antecedent in another form, it follows that the Gender and Number must be the same; so that the principle of the second and third general rules is explained.

On the other hand, the Relative is *not* necessarily in the same case as the Antecedent; *e. g.*

1. John [*who* trusts me] comes here;
2. John [*whom* I trust] comes here;
3. John [*whose* trust is in me] comes here;
4. I trust John [*who* trusts me].

§ 276. The Antecedent may appear in either the Subject or the Predicate.

He steals trash
Who steals my purse.

I punished him
Who stole my purse.

Who steals my purse steals trash.

Contrast with this—

He who fights and runs away
May live to fight another day;
But *he* who is in battle slain
Will never live to fight again.

If it were not, however, for the metre, *he* might be omitted; and the sentence run *who fights and runs away may live, &c.*

§ 277. The Relative is occasionally omitted; i. e. we may say *the books I sent for are come*, instead of *the books which I sent for*, &c.

§ 278. The construction of the Relative is by no means easy, and some well-known inaccuracies connected with it are to be found even in our best writers. For instance—each of the following passages is inaccurate.

— him I accuse
The city gates by this has entered.
Coriolanus.

Better leave undone, than by our deeds acquire
Too high a fame when *him* we serve's away.
Antony and Cleopatra.

Here, instead of *him* we should have *he*.

The explanation, however, of the error is, by no means, difficult. There is an Ellipsis. The full forms would be *he whom I accuse has entered the city gates—he whom we serve is away*.

Now Rule 276 has shown that the Antecedent may be omitted; so that we may, if we choose, write *whom I accuse has entered the city gates*, or *whom we serve is away*.

And Rule 277 has shown that the Relative may be omitted; so that we may, if we choose, write *he I accuse has entered*, &c., or, *he we serve is away*.

No rule, however, says that *both* can be dispensed with. Hence, we find that in the instances before us there is a confusion. It is the Relative, which is omitted, whilst, as if by way of compensation, the Antecedent is put in the Relative's case.

§ 279. The following instance is also exceptionable.

— Satan, than *whom*
None higher sat, thus spake.
Paradise Lost.

Whom ought to be *who*.

By writing sentences like these in full we easily ascertain the true construction.

Satan spake :

None higher sat than Satan * sat.

§ 280. The Syntax of Conjunctions is closely allied, specially to that of Adverbs, Prepositions, Verbs, and Relative Pronouns. In these relations consists a great part of its difficulty ; a difficulty of which the general character is easily understood. Whilst other words connect only the parts of the same proposition, Conjunctions connect different propositions. In order to understand how many different kinds of Conjunctions can exist, we must know all the ways in which one proposition may be connected with another. Many propositions are wholly unconnected. Propositions delivered at long intervals, or by different persons, have, for the most part, no relation to each other. In consecutive conversation, however, one statement is connected with another. Thus—

I am pleased,

because

This has happened ;

but

I should have been disappointed,

if

It had fallen out otherwise,

and

I think

that

My friends will be more surprised

than

Satisfied with the arrangement.

§ 281. Conjunctions which connect two or more Terms are called Copulative ; as *and*.

Conjunctions which connect one of two Terms, but disconnect the other, are called Disjunctive ; as *or*.

* This figure of speech is called *Attraction*. There are two names for one object. But they differ in their relation to the context. This difference, however, is merged in their identity of import ; and one *attracts* the other.

Disjunctives are either true Disjunctives or Subdisjunctives.

A true Disjunctive separates *things*. When we say *the sun, or the moon is shining*, we separate two different objects, one of which shines by day, the other by night.

Subdisjunctives separate *names*. When we say *Victoria, or the Queen of England, is our sovereign*, we speak of the same object, under different names.

The idea expressed by a Copulative may be strengthened and made clearer by the addition of the words *each, both, all three*, or the like. We may say *both sun and moon are shining. All three, Venus, Jupiter, and the Dogstar, are visible. We may also say sun and moon are both shining — Venus, &c., are, all three, visible.*

The idea expressed by a Disjunctive may be strengthened and made clearer by the addition of *either*. We may say, *either the sun or the moon is shining.*

The idea expressed by a Subdisjunctive may be strengthened and made clearer by the phrase, *in other words*. We may say, *Queen Victoria, in other words, the Queen of England, &c.*

In all these cases the words *both, &c., either, &c., and in other words, &c.*, are no true Conjunctions. They strengthen the Conjunction. The Conjunction, however, exists without them; for the operation of the strengthening words is generally Adverbial.

§ 282. *Or* and *either* have their corresponding Negatives—*nor* and *neither*. *I will either come or send* is right. So is *I will neither come nor send*. But *I will neither come or send* is wrong.

§ 283. When a question is either asked or implied, *whether* takes the place of *either*.

§ 284. Words like *either, &c.*, are generally treated as Conjunctions. This, however, they are not. The most that can be said of them is that they form part of certain Conjunctional expressions. They never stand alone.

Meanwhile, the words with which they correspond can, as a general rule, do without them. We say *this* or *that*, *mine* or *his*, quite as correctly as *either this* or *that*, *neither mine* nor *his*. *Both*, *neither* and *whether*, seem to be both Pronouns and Adverbs. When *either* means *one out of two*, it is a Pronoun. When it means *in the way of an alternative*, it is an Adverb.

§ 285. Conjunctions which denote the dependence of one act on another are Causal, Illative, Final, and Conditional.

Causals give the cause of a given effect.

The day is warm
because
The sun shines.

Illatives give the inference from a given premise.

The sun shines,
therefore
The day is warm.

Finals give the object for which a given action is effected.

I do this
that
You may follow my example.

Conditionals give the conditions on which a given event depends. *The night will be fine if the stars shine.*

§ 286. Copulatives, Disjunctives, and Subdisjunctive Conjunctions must be considered in respect to the *Number* of the Verb with which they come in contact.

Copulatives require the Plural, Disjunctives and Subdisjunctives the Singular, Number.

The concord of persons.—A difficulty that occurs frequently in the Latin language is rare in English. In expressions like *ego et ille*, followed by a verb, there arises a question as to the person in which that verb shall be used. Is it to be in the first person in order to agree with

ego, or in the *third* in order to agree with *ille*? For the sake of laying down a rule upon these and similar points, the classical grammarians arrange the persons (as they do the genders) according to their *dignity*, making the verb agree with the most *worthy*. In respect to persons, the first is more worthy than the second, and the second more worthy than the third. Hence, they said—

Ego et Balbus sustulimus manus.

Tu et Balbus sustulistis manus.

Now in English, the plural form is the same for all three persons. Hence we say *I and you are friends, you and I are friends, I and he are friends, &c.*; so that, for the practice of language, the question as to the relative dignity of the three persons is a matter of indifference. Nevertheless, it *may* occur even in English. Whenever two or more pronouns of different persons, and of the *singular* number, follow each other *disjunctively*, the question of concord arises. *I or you,—you or he,—he or I.* I believe that, in these cases, the rule is as follows:—

1. Whenever the word *either* or *neither* precedes the pronouns, the verb is in the third person. *Either you or I is in the wrong—neither you nor I is in the wrong.* In this case *either* is a pronoun, and means *one of us two*.

2. Whenever the disjunctive is simple, *i. e.* unaccompanied with the word *either* or *neither*, the verb agrees with the *first* of the two pronouns.

I or he am in the wrong.

He or I is in the wrong.

Thou or he art in the wrong.

He or thou is in the wrong.

§ 287. *Conditional Conjunctions.*—Conditional Conjunctions govern the Subjunctive Mood. The chief Conditional is *if*. To say *if the sun shines the day will be clear* is considered inaccurate. The proper expression is, *if the sun shine, &c.*

Although the word *if* is the type and specimen of the Conditional Conjunction, there are several others so closely related to it in meaning as to agree with it in requiring a Subjunctive Mood to follow them.

1. *Except* I be by Silvia in the night,
There is no music in the nightingale.
2. Let us go and sacrifice to the Lord our God *lest* he fall upon us with pestilence.
3. Let him not go *lest* he die.
4. He shall not eat of the holy thing *unless* he wash his flesh with water.
5. *Although* my house be not so with God.
6. — revenge back on itself recoils.
Let it. I reckon not so it *light* well aimed.
7. Seek out his wickedness *till* thou find none.

And so on with *before, ere, as long as.*

§ 288. On the other hand, *if* itself is not always conditional, being occasionally equivalent to *since*; in which case it may be followed by an Indicative Mood.

§ 289. *As* follows Adjectives or Adverbs of the Positive Degree, preceded by *so*. *Be so kind as to come here.*

§ 290. *Than* follows Adjectives and Adverbs of the Comparative Degree. *This is sharper than that. I see better to-day than yesterday.*

Than, in respect to its etymology, is neither more nor less than *then*. It is not difficult to see the connection in sense between such sentences as *I like this better than I like that*, and *I like this—then (afterwards or next in order) I like that*.

Than is sometimes treated as a preposition when it seems to govern a case.

Thou art a girl *as* much brighter than *her*.

As he is a poet sublimer than *me*.—PROM.

You are a much greater loser than *me*.—SWIFT.

It is better, however, to treat it as a Conjunction, in which case the Noun which follows it depends upon the

Verb of the antecedent clause. 1. *I like you better than he*=*I like you better than he likes you*. 2. *I like you better than him*=*I like you better than I like him*.

§ 291. *But*, in respect to its etymology, is *be-utan*=*by out*. It is not difficult to see the connection in sense between such sentences as *all but one*, and *all without* (or *except*) one.

But, then, is a Preposition and an Adverb, as well as a Conjunction. Prepositional Construction.—*They all ran away but me*, i. e. *except me*. Conjunctional Construction.—*They all ran away but I*, i. e. *but I did not run away*.

No Conjunction can govern a Case. A word that governs a Case, be it ever so like a Conjunction, is no Conjunction but a Preposition.

§ 292. *Yes* and *No* are, perhaps, words sufficiently peculiar to justify us in treating them as a separate Part of Speech; for it may be observed that, unlike any word hitherto noticed, they constitute a whole Proposition by themselves. *Yes*=*it is*, while *no*=*it is not*. At the same time, they depend upon what has preceded, for unless a question has been asked how is an answer to be given? There is nothing to reply to.

§ 293. The Negative follows the Verb unless it be in the Infinitive Mood; in which case it precedes it;—*He spoke not*, *he moved not*, *he did not*, *he could not*; *but not to advance is to retreat*; *he did not speak*, *he could not move*.

Two Negatives make an Affirmative. *I have not not seen him*=*I have seen him*.

A question to which no answer can be given is much the same as a Negative. A person who, in extreme perplexity, says *what am I to do*? really means *I know not what to do*. These are called Questions of Appeal.

§ 294. In all questions there is a transposition of the Terms. In *what is this*? the word *what* is the Predicate. Yet it begins the sentence. In *are you at home*? the word *are*, though it begins the sentence, is a *Copula*.

When the Copula precedes the Predicate, the question is categorical, and its answer is *Yes* or *No*.—Question. *Is John at home?* Answer. *Yes* or *no* as the case may be.

When the Predicate precedes the Copula the question is Indefinite, and the answer may be anything whatever. To *where is John?* we may answer *at home, abroad, in the garden, in London, I do not know, &c., &c.*

The Reciprocal Construction.—§ 295. In all sentences containing the statement of a reciprocal or mutual action there are in reality two assertions, one that *A. strikes* (or *loves*) *B.*; and another that *B. strikes* (or *loves*) *A.* Hence, if the expression exactly coincided with the fact signified, there would always be two full propositions. This, however, is not the habit of language. Hence arises a more compendious form of expression, giving origin to an ellipsis of a peculiar kind. Phrases like *Eteocles and Polynices killed each other* are elliptic, for *Eteocles and Polynices killed—each the other*. Here the second proposition expands and explains the first, whilst the first supplies the verb to the second; so that each clause is elliptic. The first is without the object, the second without the verb. That the verb must be in the plural number, that one of the nouns must be in the nominative case, and the other in the objective, is self-evident from the structure of the sentence.

This is the syntax. As to the power of the words *each* and *one*, I am not prepared to say that in the common practice of the English language there is any distinction between them. A distinction, however, if it existed, would give precision to our language. Where *two* persons performed a reciprocal action, the expression might be, *one another*; as, *Eteocles and Polynices killed one another*. Where *more than two* persons were engaged on each side of a reciprocal action, the expression might be, *each other*; as, *the ten champions praised each other*. This amount of perspicuity is attained, by different

processes, in the French, Spanish, and Scandinavian languages.

(1.) French.—*Ils* (i. e. A. and B.) *se battaient*—*l'un l'autre*. *Ils* (A. B. C.) *se battaient*—*les uns les autres*.

(2.) In Spanish, *uno otro*=*l'un l'autre*, and *unos otros*=*les uns les autres*.

(3.) Danish.—*Hinander*=the French *l'un l'autre*; whilst *hverandre*=*les uns les autres*.

PART V.

PROSODY.

§ 296. The term *Prosody*, derived from a Greek word (*prosodia*) signifying *accent*, includes not only the doctrines of accent and quantity, but also the rules of metre and versification.

Take the sentence last written, count the syllables, and mark those that are accented.

The term *Prosody*, derived from a Greek word signifying *accent*, includes not only the doctrines of *accent* and *quantity*, but also the rules of *metre* and *versification*.

Here the accented syllables are the 2nd, 3rd, 7th, 10th, 11th, 12th, 14th, 16th, &c. ; that is, between two accented syllables there are sometimes one, sometimes two, and sometimes no unaccented syllables intervening. In other words, there is no regularity in the recurrence of the accent.

Proceed in the same way with the following lines.

The way was long, the wind was cold,
The minstrel was infirm and old.

Here the syllables accented are the 2nd, 4th, 6th, and 8th ; that is, every other syllable.—Again, in

At the close of the day, when the hamlet is still,

the syllables accented are the 3rd, 6th, 9th, and 12th ; that is, every third syllable.

Now, the extract where there was no regularity in the recurrence of the accent was prose ; and the extracts where

the accent recurred at regular intervals formed metre—*metre being a general term for the recurrence within certain intervals of syllables similarly accented.*

§ 297. *Measures.*—For every accented syllable in the following line, write *a*, and for every unaccented one *x*, so that *a* may stand for an accent, *x* for the absence of one—*The way was long, the wind was cold*—or expressed symbolically, *x a x a x a x a*, where *x* coincides with *the*, *a* with *way*, &c.

§ 298. Determine the length of the line in question.—It is plain that this may be done in two ways. We may either measure by the syllables, and say that the line consists of eight syllables; or by the accents, and say that it consists of four accents. In this latter case we take the accented syllable with its corresponding unaccented one, and, grouping the two together, deal with the pair as one. Now, a group of syllables thus taken together is called a *measure*. In the line in question *the way* (*x a*) is one measure; *was long* (*x a*) another.

In lines like the following the measure is the reverse of the preceding. The accented syllable comes first, the unaccented one follows; the formula being *a x*.

Láy thy bów of peárl apárt,
A'nd thy sílver shining quíver.

The number of dissyllabic measures is necessarily limited to two, expressed by *a x* and *x a* respectively. The number of trisyllabic measures is necessarily limited to three, viz.: *a x x*, *x a x* and *x x a*.

§ 299. *Rhyme.*—Observe, in each of the following couplets, the last syllable of each line. These are said to *rhyme* to each other, or to constitute *rhymes*.

O'er the glad waters of the dark blue sea,
Our thoughts as boundless, and our souls as free;
Far as the breeze can bear, the billows foam,
Survey our empire and behold our home;
These are our realms; no limits to our sway;
Our flag the sceptre all who meet obey.—BYRON.

Syllables may be similar in their sound, and yet fail in furnishing full, true, and perfect rhymes.

I.

The soft-flowing outline that steals from the *eye*
Who threw o'er the surface,—did you or did *I*?

WHITEHEAD.

II.

'Tis with our judgments as our watches; *none*
Go just alike, yet each believes his *own*.—POPE.

III.

Soft o'er the shrouds ærial whispers *breathe*,
That seem'd but zephyrs to the train *beneath*.—POPE.

§ 300. *Analysis of a pair of Rhyming Syllables*.—Let the syllables *told* and *bold* be taken to pieces. Viewed in reference to metre, they consist of three parts or elements: 1. The vowel (*o*); 2. the parts *preceding* the vowel (*t* and *b* respectively); 3. the parts *following* the vowel (*ld*). Now the vowel and the parts following the vowel are alike in both words; but the part preceding the vowel is different in the different words (*told*, *bold*). This difference between the parts preceding the vowel is essential; since, if it were not for this, the two words would be identical, or rather there would be but one word altogether. This is the case with *I* and *eye*. Sound for sound, although different in spelling, the two words are identical, and, consequently, the rhyme is faulty.

Again—compared with the words *bold* and *told*, the words *teeth* and *breeze* have two of the elements necessary to constitute a rhyme. The vowels are alike, whilst the parts preceding the vowels are different, and, as far as these two matters are concerned, the rhyme is a good one, *tee* and *bree*. Notwithstanding this, there is anything rather than a rhyme; since the parts following the vowel, instead of agreeing, differ. *Breathe* and *beneath* are in the same predicament, because the *th* is not sounded alike in the two words.

Again—the words *feel* and *mill* constitute only a false and imperfect rhyme. Sound for sound, the letters *f* and *m* are different. This is as it should be. Also, sound for sound, *l* and *ll* are identical; and this is as it should be also: but *ee* and *i* are different, and this difference spoils the rhyme. *None* and *own* are in the same predicament; since one *o* is sounded as *o* in *note*, and the other as the *u* in *but*.

We have now got the notion of full, true, and perfect rhymes as opposed to false and imperfect ones. For two words to fully, truly, and perfectly rhyme to each other, it is necessary—

1. That the vowel be the same in both.
2. That the parts following the vowel be the same.
3. That the parts preceding the vowel be different.

Beyond this it is necessary that the syllables should be accented. *Sky* and *lie* give good rhymes, but *sky* and *merrily* bad ones, and *merrily* and *stony* worse.

§ 301. *Varieties of imperfect Rhymes.*—*None* and *own* are better rhymes than *none* and *man*; because there are degrees in the amount to which sounds differ from one another; and the sounds of the *o* in *none* and the *o* in *own* are more alike than the sounds of the *o* in *none* and the *a* in *man*. In like manner *breathe* and *teeth* are nearer to rhymes than *breathe* and *teal*. In imperfect rhymes there are degrees, and some approach the nature of true ones more closely than others.

In matters of rhyme the letter *h*, being no articulate sound, counts as nothing. *High* and *I*, *hair* and *air*, are imperfect rhymes:

Whose generous children narrow'd not their *hearts*
With commerce, giv'n alone to arms and *arts*.—BYRON.

Words where the letters coincide, but the sounds differ, are only rhymes to the eye. *Breathe* and *beneath* are in this predicament; so also are *cease* and *ease* (*eaze*).

In the fat age of pleasure, wealth, and ease,
Sprang the rank weed, and thrived with large increase.—Pope.

On the other hand, if the sounds coincide the difference of the letters is unimportant.

Bold in the practice of mistaken rules,
Prescribe, apply, and call their masters fools.—Pope.

§ 302. Accent is essential to English metre. Rhyme, on the other hand, is only an ornament. Of all the ornaments of English versification it is undoubtedly the most important. Still it is not essential. Metres where there is no rhyme are called Blank Metres.

§ 303. The English measures are as follows:—

- | | | |
|--|---|--------------|
| 1. a x.— <i>tyrant, silly,</i> | } | Dissyllabic. |
| 2. x a.— <i>presume, deter,</i> | | |
| 3. a x x.— <i>merrily, fortify,</i> | } | Trisyllabic. |
| 4. x a x.— <i>disable, preferring,</i> | | |
| 5. x x a.— <i>refugee, cavalier,</i> | | |

§ 304. *The last measure in a line or verse is indifferent as to its length.*—By referring to the section upon single rhymes, we shall find that the number of syllables is just double the number of accents. Hence, with five accents, there are to each line ten syllables. This is not the case when the rhymes are double, and the last accented syllable has *two* unaccented ones to follow it. With five accents there are to each line *eleven* syllables. In the last measure, however, of any verse, supernumerary unaccented syllables can be admitted without destroying the original character of the measure.

Now in the last pair of couplets in § 305 the original character of the measure is *x a* throughout, until we get to the words *disséver* and *for éver*; when a change takes place, and the line contains an *extra* syllable. At the first view it seems proper to say that in these last-mentioned cases *x a* is converted into *x a x*. A different view, however, is the more correct one. *Disséver*, and *for éver*, are rather *x a* with

a syllable over. This extra syllable may be expressed by the sign *plus* (+), so that the words in point may be expressed by *x a +*, rather than by *x a x*. It is very clear that a measure whereof the last syllable is accented can only vary from its original character on the side of excess; that is, it can only be altered by the *addition* of fresh syllables.

With the measures *a x*, *a x x*, *x a x*, the case is different. Here a syllable or syllables may be subtracted.

Queen and huntress, chaste and fair,
Now the sun is laid to sleep,
Seated in thy silver chair,
State in wonted splendour keep.
Hesperus invokes thy light,
Goddess, exquisitely bright.—BEN JONSON.

In all these lines the last measure is deficient in a syllable, yet the deficiency is allowable, because each measure is the last one of the line. The formula for expressing *fair*, *sleep*, *chair*, &c. is not *a*, but rather *a x* followed by the *minus* sign (—), or *a x —*.

A little consideration will show, that *x a* and *x x a* naturally form single, *a x* and *x a x* double, and *a x x* treble rhymes.

§ 305. *Measure*.—Dissyllabic.

Four measures :—

And a gentle consort made he;
And her gentle mind was such,
That she grew a noble lady,
And the people loved her much.
But a trouble weigh'd upon her,
And perplex'd her night and morn
With the burden of an honour
Unto which she was not born.—TENNYSON.

Five measures :—

Then methought I heard a hollow sound,
Gath'ring up from all the lower ground.
Narrowing in to where they sat assembled,
Low voluptuous music winding trembled.—Id.

Six measures :—

O'n a moúntain, strétch'd beneath a hoáry willow,
Láy a shépherd swain, and view'd the rólling billow.

Seven measures :—

Wé have hád enough of áction ánd of mótion ; wé—
Lét us sweár an oáth, and kéeep it, with an équal mind.
Id.

Eight measures :—

Cómrades, leáve me hére a little, while as yét 'tis éarly mórn :
Leáve me hére ; and, wén you wánt me, sóund upón the búgle hórñ.
Id.

Accent on the *even* syllables.

Two measures :—

Unhéárd, unknoún,	The stráins decáy,
He mákes his móan—	And mélt áwáy.
What sóunds wére héárd !	Upón a moúntain,
What scénes appéárd—	Beside a fóuntain.

'Twas when the seas were roaring
With hollow blasts of wind,
A damsel lay deploring,
All on a rock reclined.—GAY.

Four measures :—

His aspect and his air imprest
A troubled memory on my breast ;
And long upon my startled ear
Rung his dark courser's hoofs of fear.—BYRON.

Five measures :—

Fond fool ! six feet of earth is all thy store,
And he that seeks for all shall have no more.—BISHOP HALL.

The meeting points the sacred hair dissever
From her fair head for ever and for ever.—POPE.

§ 306. The general term for metres of five accents, with the accent on the even syllables, is *Heroic*. The first division into which the heroic metres fall is into, *a.* Blank heroics ; *b.* Rhyming heroics.

Blank Heroics.—Blank heroics, or blank verse, as it is generally called, falls into two varieties, determined by the nature of the subject-matter ; *a.* Dramatic blank verse ; *b.* Narrative blank verse.

Dramatic Blank Verse.—With the exception of the earliest dramas in the language, and some rhyming tragedies written in imitation of the French in the time of Charles II., the works for the English stage consist chiefly of either prose or blank verse. It is in blank verse that most tragedies and many comedies are either wholly or partially written.

Dramatic blank verse not only admits, but calls for supernumerary syllables. In rhyming metres these would constitute double rhymes.

OTHELLO'S SPEECH BEFORE THE SENATORS.

Most potent, grave, and reverend seigniors,
My very noble and approved good *masters*,
That I have ta'en away this old man's *daughter*,
It is most true: true, I have married her:
The very head and front of my *offending*
Hath this extent, no more.—SHAKESPEAR.

Narrative Blank Verse.—The metre of *Paradise Lost*, *Paradise Regained*, *Young's Night Thoughts*, *Cowper's Task*, *Cowper's Homer*, &c.

Nine times the space that measures day and night
To mortal men, he, with his horrid crew,
Lay vanquish'd, rolling in the fiery gulf
Confounded, though immortal.—MILTON.

Here the admission of a supernumerary final syllable is rare ; lines of *eleven* syllables like the following being uncommon.

Of sovran power with awful ceremony.—MILTON.

Six measures :—

He lifted up his hand that back again did start.

Seven measures :—

The Lórd descénded fróm abóve, and bówed the heávens most high,
And úndernéath his feét he cást the dárkness óf the ský.

STERNHOLD AND HOPKINS.

Eight measures :—

Where virtúe wánts, and více abóunds, and weálth is bút a báited hóók
Wherewith men swállow dówn the báne befóre on dánger dárk they lóók.

§ 307. The Three Trisyllabic Measures—Accent on the
1st, 4th, &c., syllables.

Two measures :—

Pibroch o' Dónuil Dhu!
Pibroch o' Dónuil!
Wáke thy shrill voice anew,
Súmmon Clan Cónnuil.
Cóme away, cóme away,
Hárk to the súmmons!
Cóme in your wár array,
Géntiles and cómmuns.—

Cóme every hill-plaid, and
Trúe heart that wéars one;
Cóme every steel-blade, and
Stróng hand that béars one.—
Leáve the deer, leáve the steer,
Leáve nets and bárges:
Cóme with your fighting-gear,
Broádswords and tárges.

SCOTT.

Three measures :—

Peáce to thee, ísle of the ócean,
Peáce to thy bréezes and bíllows.—BYRON.

Four measures :—

Wárríors or chíefs, should the sháft or the swórd
Pierce me in léading the hóst of the Lórd,
Heéd not the córpse, though a kíng's in your páth,
Búry your steel in the bósons of Gáth.—BYRON.

Two measures :—

Besíde her are láid
Her máttóck and spáde—
Alóne she is thére,
Her shóuldérs are báre—
Ever alóne
She máketh her móán.

TENNYSON.

But váinly thou wárrést;
For thís is alóne in
Thy pówer to déclare,
That, in the díim fórest,
Thou héárd'st a low móáning.

COLERIDGE.

The bláck bands came óver
The A'ts and their snów ;
With Bóurbon, the róver,
They pássed the broad Pó.

The Bóurbon! the Bóurbon!
Sans countrý or hóme,
We'll fóllo the Bóurbon
To plúnder old Róme.

BYRON.

Four measures :—

Oh, hush thee, my bábie, thy sire was a knight,
Thy móther a lády both lóvely and bright :
The wóods and the gléns and the tówers which we seé,
They áll are bélonging, dear bábie, to theé.

One measure :—

As ye sweép
Through the deép.—CAMPBELL.

Two measures :—

In my ráge shall be seén
The revéngé of a queén.—ADDISON.

Three measures :—

And the spárkles they flásh from their éyes !

Mixed.

See the snákes, how they réar,
How they hiss in the air,
And the spárkles they flásh from their éyes.—DRYDEN.

Four measures :—

And the king seized a flámbeau with zeál to destróy.—DRYDEN.

§ 308. Lines or verses grouped together constitute stanzas, couplets, triplets, &c. It is only a few of the English metres that are known by fixed names. These are as follows :—

1. *Octosyllabics*.—Butler's *Hudibras*, Scott's poems, The *Giaour*, and other poems of Lord Byron—*eight measures*.

The way was long, the wind was cold,
The minstrel was infirm and old ;
His haggard cheek and tresses gray
Seem'd to have known a better day ;
The harp, his sole remaining joy,
Was carried by an orphan boy,
The last of all the bards was he
That sung of ancient chivalry.—SCOTT.

2. *Octosyllabics*.—Same as the last; except that the rhymes are regularly alternate, and the verses arranged in stanzas.

And on her lover's arm she leant,
 And round her waist she felt it fold,
 And far across the hills they went,
 In that new world which now is old:
 Across the hills and far away,
 Beyond their utmost purple rim,
 And deep into the dying day
 The happy princess follow'd him.—TENNYSON.

3. *Octosyllabic Triplets*.—Three rhymes in succession. Generally arranged as stanzas.

I blest them, and they wander'd on;
 I spoke, but answer came there none:
 The dull and bitter voice was gone.—TENNYSON.

4. *Blank Verse*.—Five dissyllabic measures, with accents on the even syllable, without rhyme.

All these and more came flocking; but with looks
 Downcast and damp, yet such wherein appear'd
 Obscure some glimpse of joy to have found their chief
 Not in despair, to have found themselves not lost
 In loss itself.—MILTON.

5. *Heroic Couplets*.—Five measures, as before, with pairs of rhymes.

O'er the glad waters of the dark blue sea,
 Our thoughts as boundless, and our souls as free;
 Far as the breeze can bear, the billows foam,
 Survey our empire and behold our home:
 These are our realms; no limits to our sway;
 Our flag the sceptre all who meet obey.—BYRON.

6. *Heroic Triplets*.—Five measures, as before. Three rhymes in succession. Arranged in stanzas.

7. *Elegiacs*.—Five measures, as before; with regularly alternate rhymes, and arranged in stanzas.

The curfew tolls the knell of parting day,
 The lowing herds wind slowly o'er the lea,
 The ploughman homewards plods his weary way,
 And leaves the world to darkness and to me.—GRAY.

8. *Rhymes Royal*.—Seven lines of heroics, with the last two rhymes in succession, and the first five recurring at intervals.

This Troilus, in gift of curtesie,
 With hawk on hond, and with a huge rout
 Of knightes, rode, and did her company,
 Passing all through the valley far about;
 And further would have ridden out of doubt.
 Full faine and woe was him to gone so sone;
 But turn he must, and it was eke to doen.—CHAUCER.

This metre was common with the writers of the earlier part of Queen Elizabeth's reign. It admits of varieties according to the distribution of the first five rhymes.

9. *Ottava Rima*.—A metre with an Italian name, and borrowed from Italy, where it is used generally for narrative poetry. The *Morgante Maggiore* of Pulci, the *Orlando Innamorato* of Bojardo, the *Orlando Furioso* of Ariosto, the *Gierusalemme Liberata* of Tasso, are all written in this metre. Besides this, the two chief epics of Spain and Portugal respectively, the *Araucana* and the *Lusiados*, are thus composed. Hence it is a form of poetry which is Continental rather than English, and naturalized rather than indigenous. The stanza consists of eight lines of heroics, the six first rhyming alternately, the two last in succession.

Arrived there, a prodigious noise he hears,
 Which suddenly along the forest spread;
 Whereat from out his quiver he prepares
 An arrow for his bow, and lifts his head;
 And lo! a monstrous herd of swine appears,
 And onward rushes with tempestuous tread,
 And to the fountain's brink precisely pours,
 So that the giant's join'd by all the boars.—BYRON.

10. *Terza Rima*.—Like the last, borrowed both in name and nature from the Italian, and scarcely yet naturalized in England.

The Spirit of the fervent days of old,
 When words were things that came to pass, and Thought
 Flash'd o'er the future, bidding men behold
 Their children's children's doom already brought
 Forth from the abyss of Time which is to be,
 The chaos of events where lie half-wrought
 Shapes that must undergo mortality :
 What the great seers of Israel wore within,
 That Spirit was on them and is on me ;
 And if, Cassandra-like, amidst the din
 Of conflicts, none will hear, or hearing, heed
 This voice from out the Wilderness, the sin
 Be theirs, and my own feelings be my meed,
 The only guerdon I have ever known.—BYRON.

11. *Alexandrines*.—Six measures ; like the last, generally, perhaps always, with rhyme. The name is said to be taken from the fact that early romances upon the deeds of Alexander of Macedon, of great popularity, were written in this metre. One of the longest poems in the English language is in *Alexandrines*, viz. Drayton's *Poly-olbion*.

Ye sacred bards that to your harps' melodious strings
 Sung th' ancient heroes' deeds, the monuments of kings ;
 If, as those Druids taught who kept the British rites,
 And dwelt in darksome groves, there counselling with sprites,
 When these our souls by death our bodies do forsake,
 They instantly again to other bodies take,
 I could have wish'd your souls redoubled in my breast,
 To give my verse applause to time's eternal rest.—DRAYTON.

12. *Spenserian Stanza*.—A stanza consisting of nine lines, the eight first heroics, the last an Alexandrine.

It hath been through all ages ever seen,
 That with the prize of arms and chivalrie
 The prize of beauty still hath joined been,
 And that for reason's special privitie :
 For either doth on other much rely.
 For he meseems most fit the fair to serve
 That can her best defend from villanie ;
 And she most fit his service doth deserve,
 That fairest is, and from her faith will never swerve.

SPENSER.

Childe Harold and other important poems are composed in the Spenserian stanza.

13. *Service Metre*.—Couplets of seven measures. This is the common metre of the Psalm versions. It is also called Common Measure, or Long Measure. In this metre there is always a pause after the fourth measure, and many grammarians consider that with that pause the line ends. According to this view, the service metre does not consist of two long lines with seven measures each; but of four short ones, with four and three measures each alternately. The Psalm versions are printed so as to exhibit this pause or break.

The Lord descended from above, | and bow'd the heavens most high,
And underneath his feet He cast | the darkness of the sky.
On Cherubs and on Seraphim | full royally He rode,
And on the wings of mighty winds | came flying all abroad.

STERNHOLD AND HOPKINS.

In this matter the following rule is convenient. When the last syllable of the fourth measure in the one verse rhymes with the corresponding syllable in the other, the long verse should be looked upon as broken up into two short ones; in other words, the couplets should be dealt with as a stanza. Where there is no rhyme except at the seventh measure, the verse should remain undivided. Thus:—

Turn, gentle hermit of the glen, | and guide thy lonely way
To where yon taper cheers the vale | with hospitable ray—

constitute a single couplet of two lines, the number of rhymes being two. But,

Turn, gentle hermit of the dale,
And guide thy lonely way
To where yon taper cheers the vale
With hospitable ray.—GOLDSMITH.

constitute a stanza of four lines, the number of rhymes being four.

14. *Ballad Stanza*.—Service metre broken up in the way just indicated. Goldsmith's Edwin and Angelina, &c., from which the last stanza was an extract.

15. *Poulterer's Measure*.—Alexandrines and Service metre alternately.

§ 309. *Symmetrical Metres*.—Allowing for the indifference of the number of syllables in the last measure, it is evident that in all lines where the measures are dissyllabic the syllables will be a multiple of the accents, *i.e.* they will be *twice* as numerous.

Similarly, in all lines where the measures are trisyllabic, the syllables will also be multiples of the accents, *i.e.* they will be *thrice* as numerous.

Lines of this sort may be called symmetrical.

§ 310. *Unsymmetrical Metres*.—Lines, where the syllables are *not* a multiple of the accents, may be called Unsymmetrical. Occasional specimens of such lines occur (as may be seen from several of the examples already quoted) interspersed amongst others of symmetrical character. Where this occurs the general character of the versification may be considered as symmetrical also.

The case, however, is different where the whole character of the versification is unsymmetrical.

In the yéar since Jésus diéd for mén,
Eighteen húndred yéars and tén,
Wé wére a gállant cômpany,
Ríding o'er lánd and sáiling-o'er séa.
O'h ! but wé went mérrilý !
We fórded the river, and clómb the high hill,
Néver our steéds for a dáy stood still.
Whéther we láy in the cáve or the shéd,
Our sleép fell sóft on the hárdest béd ;
Whéther we cónch'd on our róugh capóte,
Or the róughér plánk of our glíding bóat ;
Or strétch'd on the beach or our sáddles spréad
As a pillow beneáth the résting héad,
Frésh we wóke upón the mórrów.
A'll our thóughts and wórds had scópe,
Wé had héalth and wé had hópe,
Tóil and trável, bút no sórrów.

These lines are naturally trisyllabic ; from any measure of which one of the unaccented syllables may be ejected. Where they are symmetrical they are so by accident. A metrical fiction, that conveniently illustrates their structure, is the doctrine that they are *lines formed upon measure x a x*, for which either *x x a* or *a x x* may be substituted, and from which either *a x* or *x a* may be formed by ejection of either the first or last unaccented syllable.

§ 311. *Convertible Metres*.—Such a line as

Ere her faithless sons betray'd her

may be read in two ways. We may either lay full stress upon the word *ere*, and read

E're her faithless sóns betráy'd her ;

or we may lay little or no stress upon either *ere* or *her*, reserving the full accentuation for the syllable *faith-* in *faithless*, in which case the reading would be

Ere her fáithless sóns betráy'd her.

Lines of this sort may be called examples of *convertible metres*, since by changing the accent a dissyllabic line may be converted into one partially trisyllabic, and *vice versá*.

This property of convertibility is explained by the fact of accentuation being a *relative quality*. In the example before us *ere* is sufficiently strongly accented to stand in contrast to *her*, but it is not sufficiently strongly accented to stand upon a par with the *faith-* in *faithless* if decidedly pronounced.

The real character of convertible lines is determined from the character of the lines with which they are associated. That the second mode of reading the line in question is the proper one, may be shown by reference to the stanza wherein it occurs.

Let E'rin remémber her dáys of óld,
 Ere her faithless sóns betráy'd her,
 When Málachi wóre the cóllar of góld,
 Which he wón from the pród inváder.

Again, such a line as

Fór the glóry I' have lóst,

although it may be read

For the glóry I' have lóst,

would be read improperly. The stanza wherein it occurs is essentially dissyllabic (*a x*).

Heéd, oh heéd my fátal stóry!

I' am Hósier's injured ghóst,

Cóme to seek for fame and glóry—

Fór the glory I' have lóst.

§ 312. *Metrical and Grammatical Combinations*.—Words, or parts of words, that are combined as measures, are words, or parts of words, combined *metrically*, or in *metrical combination*. Syllables combined as words, or words combined as portions of a sentence, are syllables and words *grammatically combined*, or in *grammatical combination*.

The syllables *ere her faith-* form a metrical combination.

The words *her faithless sons* form a grammatical combination.

When the syllables contained in the same measure are also contained in the same construction, the metrical and the grammatical combinations coincide. Such is the case with the line

Remémber | the glóries | of Brian | the Bráve;

where the same division separates both the measure and the subdivisions of the sense, inasmuch as the word *the* is connected with the word *glories* equally in grammar and in metre, in syntax and in prosody. So is *of* with *Brian*, and *the* with *Brave*.

Contrast with this such a line as

Lay vanquished, rolling in the fiery gulf.

Here the metrical division is one thing, the grammatical division another, and there is no coincidence.

Metrical,

Lay ván | quished, rôll | ing in | the fiér | y gúlf.

Grammatical,

Lay vanquished, | rolling | in the fiery gulf.

The variety which arises in versification from the different degrees of the coincidence and non-coincidence between the metrical and grammatical combinations may be called *Rhythm*.

§ 313. *English Metres and Classical*.—The English metres are based upon *Accent*, the Latin and Greek metres upon *Quantity*. By treating an accented syllable as the equivalent to a long, and an unaccented syllable as the equivalent to a short one, we get a loose kind of analogy, which, from the fact of its having been, to some extent, recognized, requires notice. Subject to this view, the metrical notation for—

The wáy was lóng, the wind was còld—

Mérrily, mérrily, sháll I live nów—

would be, not—

x a, x a, x a, x a,
a x x, a x x, a x x, a

respectively, but—

— — — — —
— — — — —

Again—

As they splásh in the blóod of the slippéry stréet,

is not—

x x a, x x a, x x a, x x a,

but—

— — — — —

From this point of view there is a certain number of Latin and Greek *feet* with their syllables affected in the way of *quantity*, to which there are equivalent English *measures* with their syllables affected in the way of *accent*. Thus if the formula

— —	be a classical, the formula	$a x$	is an English	<i>trochee</i> .
— —	"	"	$x a$	" <i>iambus</i> .
— — —	"	"	$a x x$	" <i>dactyle</i> .
— — —	"	"	$x a x$	" <i>amphibrachys</i> .
— — —	"	"	$x x a$	" <i>anapæst</i> .

And so on in respect to the larger groups of similarly affected syllables which constitute whole lines and stanzas; verses like

Cóme to séeK for fáme and glóry—
 The wáy was lóng, the wind was cold—
 Mérrily, mérrily, sháll I live nów—
 But ráinly thou wárrést—
 At the clóse of the dáy when the hámlet is still—

are (a) trochaic; (b) iambic; (c) dactylic; (d) amphibrachy; and (e) anapæstic, respectively. And thus, with the exception of the word *amphibrachy* (which I do not remember to have seen), the terms have been used. And on this principle, with the same exception, systems of versification have been classified.

To show, however, that this view is exceptionable, let us compare a so-called English anapæst like—

As they splásh in the blóod of the slippéry streét—
 with

Δέκατον μὲν ἔτος τόδ' ἐπεὶ Πριάμου.

For the latter line to have the same movement as the former, it must be read thus—

Dekátón men etós to d' epéi Priamóu.

Now we well know that, whatever may be an English scholar's notions of the Greek accents, this is not the way in which he reads Greek anapæsts. In applying Latin names to English metres we can get a 'loose analogy,' but we can get nothing more.

§ 314. *Alliteration of the Anglo-Saxon and other Metres.*
 In Anglo-Saxon, the metres were, what is called, Alliterative, i.e. a certain number of accented initial syllables,

within the space of either a single line or a couplet, began with the same letter: the vowels passing for identical. This system was not only Anglo-Saxon, but Norse as well, and in a less degree, German also.

§ 315. SPECIMENS.

ANGLO-SAXON.

OPENING OF BEOWULF. (*Tenth Century.*)

Hwæt we Gār-Dena,	Lo! we of the-Gar-Denes
in gear-dagum,	In the days-of-yore,
þeód-cýninga,	Of the people-kings,
þrym ge-frunon—	Glory have-heard—
hú ða Æþelingas	How the Athelings
ellen fremedon	Strength promoted—
oft Scyld Scefing,	Of Scyld Scefing
sceaþen(a) þreátum,	Of enemies to-the-hosts,
monegum mægþum,	To many nations,
meodo-setla of-teáh—	The mead-settles off-drove—
egsode eorl—	The earl terrified—
syððan ærest wearð	Since erst was
feá-sceaft funden;	Fee-ship found—
he þæs frófre ge-bá(d),	He for this prosperous bided,
weóx under wolcnum,	Waxed under welkin,
weorð-mýndum þáh;	With worth-memorials throve,
oð þæt him æg-hwylc	Till him each
þára ymb-sittendra,	Of the around-sitters,
ofer hron-ráde,	Over the whale-road,
hýran scolde,	Hear should,
gomban gyldan—	Tribute pay—
bæt wæs gód cyning.	That was good king.]

MIDDLE ENGLISH.

LANGLAND'S PIERS PLOWMAN. (*Thirteenth Century.*)

In a somer sesun,	Wende I wydene in þis world,
Whon softe was the sonne,	Wondres to here.
I schop me into a schroud,	Bote on a Mayes morwnynge,
A scheep as I were;	On Maluerne heilles,
In habit of a hermite,	Me bifel a ferly,
Vnholy of werkis,	A feyrie, me bouhte;

I was weori of wandringe,
 And wente me to reste,
 Vndur a brod banke,
 Bi a bourne syde;
 And as I lay and leonede,
 And lokede on the watres,
 I slumberde in a slepyng,
 Hit sownede so muerie.
 þenne gon I meeten
 A meruelous sweuene,

bat I was in a Wildernesse;
 Wuste I neuer where.
 And as I be beo-heold into þe Est,
 An-heigh to þe sonne,
 I sauh a tour on a toft,
 Trizely i-maket,
 A deop dale bi-neoþe,
 A dungun þer-inne,
 With deop deck and derk,
 And dredful of siht.

§ 316. OLD SAXON OF GERMANY.

Heliand, pp. 12, 13. (*Schmeller's edition.*)

LUC. II. 8-13.

Tho uuard managun cud,
 Obar thesa uiidon uuerold.
 Uuardos antfundun,
 Thea thar, ehuscalcos,
 Uta uuarun,
 Uueros an uuahtu,
 Uuiggeo gomean,
 Fehas aftar felda.
 Gisahun finistri an tuue
 Telatan an lufte;
 Endi quam liht Godes,
 Uuanum thurh thui uuolcan;
 Endi thea uuardos thar
 Bifeng an them felda.
 Sie uurdun an forhtun tho,
 Thea man an ira moda.
 Gisahun thar mahtigna
 Godes Engil cuman;
 The im tegegnes sprac.
 Het thar im thea uuardos—
 'Uuiht ne antdredin
 Ledes fon them liohta.
 Ic scal eu quadhe liobora thing,
 Suido uuarlico
 Uuilleon seggean.
 Cudean craft mikil.
 Nu is Krist geboran,
 An thesere selbun naht,
 Salig barn Godes,

Then it was to many known,
 Over this wide world.
 The words they discovered,
 Those that there, as horse-grooms,
 Without were,
 Men at watch,
 Horses to tend,
 Cattle on the field.
 They saw the darkness in two
 Dissipated in the atmosphere,
 And came a light of God
 —through the welkin;
 And the words there
 Caught on the field.
 They were in fright then
 The men in their mood.
 They saw there mighty
 God's angel come;
 That to them face-to-face spake.
 It bade thus them these words—
 'Dread not a whit
 Of mischief from the light.
 I shall to you speak glad things.
 Very true;
 Say commands;
 Show strength great.
 Now is Christ born.
 In this self-same night;
 The blessed child of God,

An thera Davides burg,
 Drohtin the godo.
 That is mendislo
 Manno cunneas,
 Allaro firihō fruma.
 Thar gi ina fidan mugan,
 An Bethlema burg,
 Barno rikiost.
 Hebbiath that te tecna,
 That ic eu gitellean mag,
 Uuarun uuordun,
 That he thar biuundan ligid,
 That kind an enera cribbium,
 Tho he si cuning obar al
 Erdun endi himiles,
 Endi obar eldeo barn,
 Uueroldes uualdand.'

In the David's city,
 The Lord the good.
 That is exultation
 To the races of men,
 Of all men the advancement.
 There ye may find him
 In the city of Bethlehem,
 The noblest of children.
 Ye have as a token
 That I tell ye
 True words,
 That he there swathed lieth,
 The child in a crib,
 Though he be king over all
 Earth and Heaven,
 And over the sons of men,
 Of the world the Ruler.'

§ 317. OLD HIGH GERMAN.

Daz hort ih rahhon,
 Dia werolt rehtwison
 Daz sculi der Antichriste
 Mit Eliase pāgen.
 Der warch ist kiwāfinit;
 Denne wirdit untar in
 Wik arhapan;
 Khensun sind so kreftee;
 Diu kosa ist so mihhil,
 Elias stritit
 Pi den euigon līp;
 Will den rehtkernon
 Daz rihi kistarkan:
 Pidiu scal imo halfan
 Der himiles kiwaltit.
 Der Antichristo stēt
 Pi dem altfante;
 Stēt pi demo Satanase;
 Der inan farsenkan scal;
 Podiu scal er in der wroksteti
 Wunt pivallan;
 Enti in demo sinde
 Sigalos werdan.

That have I heard relate
 The worldwise
 That should the Antichrist
 With Elias struggle.
 The traitor is armed;
 Then becomes between them
 War raised.
 The champions are so strong;
 The case is so great.
 Elias strives
 For the everlasting life,
 Will by the right-doing
 The kingdom strengthen;
 Therein shall him help
 Who rules heaven,
 The Antichrist stands
 By the old Fiend;
 Stands by Satan as;
 Who shall sink him.
 Both shall in fight
 Wounded fall,
 And on that occasion
 Be without victory.

§ 318. OLD HIGH GERMAN.

WEISSOBRUN HYMN.

Dat chifregin ih mit firahim	That have I heard among men,
Firiuuizzo meista;	Of the fore-wise most,
Dat ero ni uwas, noh ufhimil,	That erst neither was, nor heaven
	above,
Noh paum noh perag,	Nor tree, nor berg,
Ni (sterro) nohheinig,	Nor [star] nor . . .
Noh sunna noh scein.	Nor sun shone.
Noh mana ni liuhta.	Nor moon gave light.

§ 319. OLD NORSE.

THE OLDER EDDA,

Völuspá.

1.	1.
<i>Hlióðs bið ek allar</i>	Silence ask I of all,
<i>helgar kindir,</i>	Holy children,
<i>meiri ok minni,</i>	Lesser and greater,
<i>mögu Heimdallar;</i>	Sons of Heimdall;
<i>vildu at ek Valföðrs</i>	Wilt thou that I Valfader's
<i>fél framtelja?</i>	Weal forth-tell?
<i>fornspjöll fira,</i>	Fore-spells of men,
<i>þau er ek fremst um man.</i>	They (<i>whom</i>) I first mind.
2.	2.
<i>Ek man jötna</i>	I mind of Yotuns
<i>ár um borna,</i>	Years ago born,
<i>þá er forðum</i>	They (<i>who</i>) fore-times
<i>mik fœdda höfðu;</i>	Me fed have:
<i>niu man ek heima,</i>	Nine mind I homes,
<i>niu íviðjur,</i>	Nine * * *
<i>mjötvið mæran</i>	The mid-wood great,
<i>fyr mold neðan.</i>	Before the mould nether.
3.	3.
<i>A'r var alda</i>	Yore was of ages
<i>þar er Ymir bygðr,</i>	Then when Ymer built,
<i>vara sandr né sær</i>	Was (<i>nor</i>) sand nor sea,
<i>né svalar unnir,</i>	Nor cool waters;
<i>jörð fannsk æva</i>	Earth found-its-self never,
<i>né upphiminn,</i>	Nor up-heaven,
<i>gap var ginnunga,</i>	Gaping was yawning,
<i>en gras hvergi.</i>	And grass nowhere.

The following is from Thorlakson's Translation of
'Paradise Lost':—

MODERN ICELANDIC.

Um fyrsta manns
felda hlyðni
ok átlýsting
af epli forboðnu,
hvaðan óvægr
upp kom dauði,
Edens missir,
ok allt böi manna;
Þartil annarr einn,
ærði maðr,
aptr fær
oss viðreista,
ok afrekar nýan
oss til handa
fullsælustað
fögurum sigri;

Sýng þú, Menta-
móðir himneska!
þú sem Hórebs fyrr
á huldum toppi,
eða Sínai,
sauðaverði
innblést fræðanda
útvalit sæði,
hve alheimr skópst
af alls samblandi;
Eða lysti þik
lángtum heldr
at Zíons hæð
ok Sílóa brunni,
sem framstreymdi
hjá Frétt guðligri, &c.

Of Man's first disobedience, and the fruit
Of that forbidden tree, whose mortal taste
Brought death into the world, and all our woe,
With loss of Eden, till one greater Man
Restore us, and regain the blissful seat,
Sing, heavenly Muse, that on the secret top
Of Oreb, or of Sinai, didst inspire
That shepherd, who first taught the chosen seed,
In the beginning how the Heavens and Earth
Rose out of Chaos: or if Sion's hill
Delight thee more, and Siloa's brook that flow'd
Fast by the oracle of God, &c.

§ 320. SWEDISH (*Present Century.*)

FROM TEGNÉR—FRITHIOF'S SAGA.

1.
Sitter i högen,
högåttad hofding;
slagsvärd vid sidan
skölden på arm
Gångaren gode
gnäggar derinne
skrapar med gullhof
grundmurad graf.

1.
Sits on high,
High-ancestered, noble;
Sword-guard by side,
Shield on arm.
Steed good
Neighs therein;
Scrapes with gold hoof
Turf-raised grave.

2.

Nu rider ríke
 Ring öfver Bifrost
 svigtar för bördan
 bågiga bron.
 Upp springa Vallhalls
 hvalfdörrar vida ;
 Asarnas händer
 hänga in hans.

2.

Now rides rich
 Ring over Bifrost (*The rainbow*)
 Sways for the burthen
 The bowlike bridge.
 Up spring Valhalla's
 Valve-doors wide
 The Asas hands
 Hang on his.

It is in the Icelandic, Scandinavian, or Norse where the Alliterative Metres are the commonest; and next to the Norse, the Anglo-Saxon. In the High German they are, comparatively, rare.

 ADDENDUM (*omitted in p. 19*).

Now we should praise
 Heaven's-kingdom's guardian,
 The might of the Lord,
 And his mood-thought;
 The glory-father of works;
 As he, of wonder each,
 Everlasting Lord,
 Erst established:

He erst shaped,
 For earth's bairns,
 Heaven to roof;
 Holy shaper.
 Then mid-earth,
 Mankind's home,
 Everlasting Lord,
 After formed,

For the homes of men,
 Lord Almighty.

 ERRATUM.

Page 4, § 11, for 'Mamertinus' read 'Eumenius.'

WORKS

BY

ROBERT GORDON LATHAM, M.A. M.D.

LATE FELLOW OF KING'S COLLEGE, CAMBRIDGE.

The ENGLISH LANGUAGE. Fifth Edition, Revised and much Improved. Complete in 1 vol. 8vo. 18s. cloth.

In this work the history of the English language is traced from its remote origin through its successive changes and periods, to its present state. The nature of its connection with all the languages which either form its basis or have been in any degree incorporated with it, is minutely detailed; and this comparison of languages is made available in determining the causes of its various peculiarities, whether of isolated words or forms of construction; thus not only supplying the student with a clue to extensive researches in philology, but suggesting the true principles of derivation and of general grammatical criticism.

A HANDBOOK of the ENGLISH LANGUAGE, for the Use of Students of the Universities and Higher Classes of Schools. Eighth Edition, small 8vo. 6s. cloth.

The object of the 'Handbook' is to present to students for examination, in a more condensed form, the chief facts and reasonings of 'The English Language.' Less elaborate than that work, it is less elementary than the 'English Grammar.' Like all the other works by the same author, it gives great prominence to the ethnological relations of our tongue; and insists upon historical investigation, and the application of the general principles of comparative philology, as the true means of exhibiting its real growth and structure, in opposition to the more usual method of treating it as a mass of irregularities. It has the further object of supplying a knowledge of those laws of speech and principles of grammar which apply to language generally.

An ELEMENTARY ENGLISH GRAMMAR, for the Use of Schools. New Edition, small 8vo. 3s. 6d. cloth.

This Edition contains chapters on Parsing and the Analysis of Sentences, and in Punctuation; followed by Exercises and Questions for Examination.

A SMALLER ENGLISH GRAMMAR, for General Use.
By Dr. R. G. LATHAM and Miss MARY CAROLINE MABERLY.
Fourth Edition, fcp. 8vo. 2s. 6d. cloth.

This little volume will, it is hoped, be found to embody all that is desirable and necessary as an outline; and the learner who masters its contents will have acquired a knowledge of the structure of his own language sufficient to enable him to speak and write it with ease and precision, and will besides have laid a safe foundation for further researches in Comparative Philology. The Questions and Exercises which have been added will help to complete the usefulness of the book.

London, LONGMANS & CO.

ENGLISH GRAMMAR for CLASSICAL SCHOOLS. Third Edition, revised and much Enlarged. Fcp. 8vo. 2s. 6d. cloth.

This is an introductory grammar, intended for those desirous of studying the English language with reference to the history, the transitions, and the analogies of its forms. It consists of an exposition of the fundamental principles of English grammar and the chief facts in the history of the language. The philological division of the work is preceded by an historical sketch of the successive introduction into this country of the dialects of the Saxons, the Angles, and the Jutes. The author reviews the earliest books of the Anglo-Saxon period, and details the points of difference which characterise the Semi-Saxon, the Old English, and the Middle and New English stages in the growth of our literature; giving, in an Appendix, the translations of the specimens cited to illustrate the several epochs.

The etymological part of the treatise commences with an analysis of orthographical systems, particularly in connection with the euphonic changes which arise from the combination of letters. The logical structure of propositions is then briefly explained; and this introductory matter is followed by the usual declensions, of which the peculiarities are so explained as to shew their affinity to the ancient Saxon and the modern German languages.

A DICTIONARY of the ENGLISH LANGUAGE, founded on that of Dr. SAMUEL JOHNSON, as Edited by the Rev. H. J. Todd, M.A. With numerous Emendations and Additions. Complete in 4 vols. 4to. price £7.

'Dr. LATHAM's work is not only an English dictionary in the strict meaning of the term, but in many important respects a very valuable addition to our national lexicography. Though nominally based on JOHNSON's dictionary, so much of the original text is discarded as imperfect or erroneous, and the additions in every department are so numerous and extensive, that it may be regarded virtually as a new book. Still, while thus amplifying and improving the original work until its form can no longer be recognised, Dr. LATHAM remains faithful in the main to its general spirit and plan; and his new Dictionary deserves to be studied by every one interested in the language: as a book of reference, it is admirably fitted for general usefulness.'—EDINBURGH REVIEW.

'The special excellence of the present over all previous editions will be found, no doubt, in the etymological department, which replaces the incorrect and often fanciful derivations of Dr. JOHNSON's day with the more accurate conclusions, especially in the derivations from Teutonic and Scandinavian roots, to which the best modern philologists have advanced their knowledge. It also replenishes the vocabulary with newly-coined and technical words which have lately come into fashion; and revises and fortifies the original authorities with examples from more recent and living writers. In most instances, too, the exact reference is added to the extracts quoted. The Editor's explanatory preface is very interesting and instructive.'—JOHN BULL.

London, LONGMANS & CO



/

NOVEMBER 1874.

GENERAL LIST OF WORKS

PUBLISHED BY

MESSRS. LONGMANS, GREEN, AND CO.

PATERNOSTER ROW, LONDON.



History, Politics, Historical Memoirs, &c.

JOURNAL of the REIGNS of KING GEORGE IV. and KING WILLIAM IV. By the late CHARLES C. F. GREVILLE, Esq. Clerk of the Council to those Sovereigns. Edited by HENRY REEVE, Registrar of the Privy Council. 3 vols. 8vo. 36s.

RECOLLECTIONS and SUGGESTIONS of PUBLIC LIFE, 1813-1878. By JOHN EARL RUSSELL. 1 vol. 8vo. *[Nearly ready.]*

The HISTORY of ENGLAND from the Fall of Wolsey to the Defeat of the Spanish Armada. By JAMES ANTHONY FROUDE, M.A. late Fellow of Exeter College, Oxford.

LIBRARY EDITION, Twelve Volumes, 8vo. price £8. 18s.

CABINET EDITION, Twelve Volumes, crown 8vo. price 72s.

The ENGLISH in IRELAND in the EIGHTEENTH CENTURY. By JAMES ANTHONY FROUDE, M.A. late Fellow of Exeter College, Oxford. 3 vols. 8vo. price 48s.

ESTIMATES of the ENGLISH KINGS from WILLIAM the CONQUEROR to GEORGE III. By J. LANGTON SANFORD. Crown 8vo. 12s. 6d.

The HISTORY of ENGLAND from the Accession of James II. By Lord MACAULAY.

STUDENT'S EDITION, 2 vols. crown 8vo. 12s.

PEOPLE'S EDITION, 4 vols. crown 8vo. 16s.

CABINET EDITION, 8 vols. post 8vo. 48s.

LIBRARY EDITION, 5 vols. 8vo. £4.

LORD MACAULAY'S WORKS. Complete and Uniform Library Edition. Edited by his Sister, Lady TREVELYAN. 8 vols. 8vo. with Portrait price £5. 5s. cloth, or £8. 8s. bound in tree-calf by Rivière.

On PARLIAMENTARY GOVERNMENT in ENGLAND; its Origin, Development, and Practical Operation. By ALPHEUS TODD, Librarian of the Legislative Assembly of Canada. 2 vols. 8vo. price £1. 17s.

The CONSTITUTIONAL HISTORY of ENGLAND, since the Accession of George III. 1760-1860. By Sir THOMAS ERSKINE MAY, C.B. The Fourth Edition, thoroughly revised. 3 vols. crown 8vo. price 18s.

DEMOCRACY in EUROPE; a History. By Sir THOMAS ERSKINE MAY, K.C.B. 2 vols. 8vo. *[In the press.]*

- The ENGLISH GOVERNMENT and CONSTITUTION** from Henry VII. to the Present Time. By JOHN EARL RUSSELL, K.G. Fcp. 8vo. 3s. 6d.
- The OXFORD REFORMERS** — John Colet, Erasmus, and Thomas More; being a History of their Fellow-work. By FREDERIC SKEBOM. Second Edition, enlarged. 8vo. 14s.
- LECTURES on the HISTORY of ENGLAND**, from the Earliest Times to the Death of King Edward II. By WILLIAM LONGMAN, F.S.A. With Maps and Illustrations. 8vo. 15s.
- The HISTORY of the LIFE and TIMES of EDWARD the THIRD.** By WILLIAM LONGMAN, F.S.A. With 9 Maps, 8 Plates, and 16 Woodcuts. 2 vols. 8vo. 28s.
- INTRODUCTORY LECTURES on MODERN HISTORY.** Delivered in Lent Term, 1842; with the Inaugural Lecture delivered in December 1841. By the Rev. THOMAS ARNOLD, D.D. 8vo. price 7s. 6d.
- WATERLOO LECTURES; a Study of the Campaign of 1815.** By Colonel CHARLES C. CHESNEY, R.E. Third Edition. 8vo. with Map, 10s. 6d.
- HISTORY of ENGLAND under the DUKE of BUCKINGHAM and CHARLES the FIRST, 1624-1628.** By SAMUEL RAWSON GARDINER, late Student of Ch. Ch. 2 vols. 8vo. [In the press.]
- The SIXTH ORIENTAL MONARCHY; or, the Geography, History, and Antiquities of Parthia.** By GEORGE RAWLINSON, M.A. Professor of Ancient History in the University of Oxford. Maps and Illustrations. 8vo. 16s.
- The SEVENTH GREAT ORIENTAL MONARCHY; or, a History of the Sassanians: with Notices, Geographical and Antiquarian.** By G. RAWLINSON, M.A. Professor of Ancient History in the University of Oxford. 8vo. with Maps and Illustrations. [In the press.]
- A HISTORY of GREECE.** By the Rev. GEORGE W. COX, M.A. late Scholar of Trinity College, Oxford. VOLS. I. & II. (to the Close of the Peloponnesian War) 8vo. with Maps and Plans, 36s.
- The HISTORY of GREECE.** By Rev. CONNOP THIRLWALL, D.D. late Bishop of St. David's. 8 vols. fcp. 8vo. 28s.
- GREEK HISTORY** from Themistocles to Alexander, in a Series of Lives from Pindarch. Revised and arranged by A. H. CLOUGH. New Edition. Fcp. with 44 Woodcuts, 6s.
- The TALE of the GREAT PERSIAN WAR**, from the Histories of Herodotus. By GEORGE W. COX, M.A. New Edition. Fcp. 2s. 6d.
- The HISTORY of ROME.** By WILLIAM IHNE. VOLS. I. and II. 8vo. price 30s. VOLS. III. and IV. preparing for publication.
- HISTORY of the ROMANS under the EMPIRE.** By the Very Rev. C. MERVILLE, D.C.L. Dean of Ely. 8 vols. post 8vo. 48s.
- The FALL of the ROMAN REPUBLIC; a Short History of the Last Century of the Commonwealth.** By the same Author. 12mo. 7s. 6d.
- The STUDENT'S MANUAL of the HISTORY of INDIA**, from the Earliest Period to the Present. By Colonel MEADOWS TAYLOR, M.B.A.S. M.R.I.A. Second Thousand. Crown 8vo. with Maps, 7s. 6d.
- The HISTORY of INDIA**, from the Earliest Period to the close of Lord Dalhousie's Administration. By J. C. MARSHMAN. 3 vols. crown 8vo. 22s. 6d.

INDIAN POLITY; a View of the System of Administration in India. By Lieutenant-Colonel GEORGE CHESNEY, Fellow of the University of Calcutta. New Edition, revised; with Map. 8vo. price 21s.

THE IMPERIAL and COLONIAL CONSTITUTIONS of the BRITANNIC EMPIRE, including INDIAN INSTITUTIONS. By Sir EDWARD CREASY, M.A. With 6 Maps. 8vo. price 15s.

THE HISTORY of PERSIA and its PRESENT POLITICAL SITUATION; with Abstracts of all Treaties and Conventions between Persia and England, and of the Convention with Baron Reuter. By CLEMENTS E. MARKHAM, C.B. F.R.S. 8vo. with Map, 21s.

REALITIES of IRISH LIFE. By W. STEUART TRENCH, late Land Agent in Ireland to the Marquess of Lansdowne, the Marquess of Bath, and Lord Digby. Cheaper Edition. Crown 8vo. price 2s. 6d.

CRITICAL and HISTORICAL ESSAYS contributed to the *Edinburgh Review*. By the Right Hon. LORD MACAULAY.

CHEAP EDITION, authorised and complete. Crown 8vo. 3s. 6d.

CABINET EDITION, 4 vols. post 8vo. 24s. | LIBRARY EDITION, 3 vols. 8vo. 36s.

PEOPLE'S EDITION, 2 vols. crown 8vo. 8s. | STUDENT'S EDITION, 1 vol. cr. 8vo. 6s.

HISTORY of EUROPEAN MORALS, from Augustus to Charlemagne By W. E. H. LECKY, M.A. Second Edition. 2 vols. 8vo. price 28s.

HISTORY of the RISE and INFLUENCE of the SPIRIT of RATIONALISM in EUROPE. By W. E. H. LECKY, M.A. Cabinet Edition, being the Fourth. 2 vols. crown 8vo. price 16s.

THE HISTORY of PHILOSOPHY, from Thales to Comte. By GEORGE HENRY LEWES. Fourth Edition. 2 vols. 8vo. 32s.

THE HISTORY of the PELOPONNESIAN WAR. By THUCYDIDES. Translated by R. CRAWLEY, Fellow of Worcester College, Oxford. 8vo. 21s.

THE MYTHOLOGY of the ARYAN NATIONS. By GEORGE W. COX, M.A. late Scholar of Trinity College, Oxford. 2 vols. 8vo. 28s.

HISTORY of CIVILISATION in England and France, Spain and Scotland. By HENRY THOMAS BUCKLE. New Edition of the entire Work, with a complete INDEX. 3 vols. crown 8vo. 24s.

SKETCH of the HISTORY of the CHURCH of ENGLAND to the Revolution of 1688. By the Right Rev. T. V. SHORT, D.D. Lord Bishop of St. Asaph. Eighth Edition. Crown 8vo. 7s. 6d.

HISTORY of the EARLY CHURCH, from the First Preaching of the Gospel to the Council of Nicea, A.D. 325. By Miss SEWELL. Fcp. 8vo. 4s. 6d.

MAUNDER'S HISTORICAL TREASURY; General Introductory Outlines of Universal History, and a series of Separate Histories. Latest Edition, revised by the Rev. G. W. COX, M.A. Fcp. 8vo. 6s. cloth, or 10s. calf.

CATES' and WOODWARD'S ENCYCLOPÆDIA of CHRONOLOGY, HISTORICAL and BIOGRAPHICAL; comprising the Dates of all the Great Events of History, including Treaties, Alliances, Wars, Battles, &c.; Incidents in the Lives of Eminent Men and their Works, Scientific and Geographical Discoveries, Mechanical Inventions, and Social Improvements. 8vo. price 42s.

THE FRENCH REVOLUTION and FIRST EMPIRE; an Historical Sketch. By WILLIAM O'CONNOR MORRIS, sometime Scholar of Oriel College, Oxford. With 2 Coloured Maps. Post 8vo. 7s. 6d.

THE HISTORICAL GEOGRAPHY of EUROPE. By E. A. FREEMAN, D.C.L. late Fellow of Trinity College, Oxford. 8vo. Maps. [In the press.]

EPOCHS of HISTORY; a Series of Books treating of the History of England and Europe at successive Epochs subsequent to the Christian Era. Edited by EDWARD E. MORRIS, M.A. of Lincoln College, Oxford. The three following are now ready :—

The Era of the Protestant Revolution. By F. SEEBOHM. With 4 Maps and 12 Diagrams. Fcp. 8vo. 2s. 6d.

The Crusades. By the Rev. G. W. Cox, M.A. late Scholar of Trinity College, Oxford. With Coloured Map. Fcp. 8vo. 2s. 6d.

The Thirty Years' War, 1618-1648. By SAMUEL RAWSON GARDINER, late Student of Christ Church. With Coloured Map. Fcp. 8vo. 2s. 6d.

The Houses of Lancaster and York; with the Conquest and Loss of France. By JAMES GAIRDNER, of the Public Record Office. With Maps. Fcp. 8vo. 2s. 6d.

Edward the Third. By the Rev. W. WARBURTON, M.A. late Fellow of All Souls College, Oxford. With Maps. Fcp. 8vo. 2s. 6d.

Biographical Works.

AUTOBIOGRAPHY. By JOHN STUART MILL. 8vo. price 7s. 6d.

The LIFE of NAPOLEON III. derived from State Records, Unpublished Family Correspondence, and Personal Testimony. By BLANCHARD JERBOLD. In Four Volumes. VOL. I. with 3 Portraits engraved on Steel and 9 Facsimiles. 8vo. price 18s. VOL. II. is in the press.

LIFE and CORRESPONDENCE of RICHARD WHATELY, D.D. Late Archbishop of Dublin. By E. JANE WHATELY. New Edition, in 1 vol. crown 8vo. [In the press.]

LIFE and LETTERS of Sir GILBERT ELLIOT, First EARL of MINTO. Edited by the COUNTESS of MINTO. 3 vols. 8vo. 31s. 6d.

MEMOIR of THOMAS FIRST LORD DENMAN, formerly Lord Chief Justice of England. By Sir JOSEPH ARNOULD, B.A. K.B. late Judge of the High Court of Bombay. With 2 Portraits. 2 vols. 8vo. 32s.

ESSAYS in MODERN MILITARY BIOGRAPHY. By CHARLES CORNWALLIS CHEESNEY, Lieutenant-Colonel in the Royal Engineers. 8vo. 12s. 6d.

ISAAC CASAUBON, 1559-1614. By MARK PATTISON, Rector of Lincoln College, Oxford. 8vo. [In the press.]

BIOGRAPHICAL and CRITICAL ESSAYS, reprinted from Reviews, with Additions and Corrections. Second Edition of the Second Series. By A. HAYWARD, Q.C. 2 vols. 8vo. price 28s. THIRD SERIES, in 1 vol. 8vo. price 14s.

The LIFE of LLOYD, FIRST LORD KENYON, LORD CHIEF JUSTICE of ENGLAND. By the Hon. GEORGE T. KENYON, M.A. of Ch. Ch. Oxford. With Portraits. 8vo. price 14s.

MEMOIR of GEORGE EDWARD LYNCH COTTON, D.D. Bishop of Calcutta and Metropolitan. With Selections from his Journals and Correspondence. Edited by Mrs. COTTON. Crown 8vo. 7s. 6d.

LIFE of ALEXANDER VON HUMBOLDT. Compiled in Commemoration of the Centenary of his Birth, and edited by Professor KARL BRUHNS; translated by JANE and CAROLINE LASSELL, with 3 Portraits. 2 vols. 8vo. 36s.

LORD GEORGE BENTINCK; a Political Biography. By the Right Hon. BENJAMIN DISRAELI, M.P. Crown 8vo. price 6s.

The LIFE of ISAMBARD KINGDOM BRUNEL, Civil Engineer. By ISAMBARD BRUNEL, B.C.L. With Portrait, Plates, and Woodcuts. 8vo. 21s.

RECOLLECTIONS of PAST LIFE. By Sir HENRY HOLLAND, Bart. M.D. F.R.S. late Physician-in-Ordinary to the Queen. Third Edition. Post 8vo. price 10s. 6d.

The LIFE and LETTERS of the Rev. SYDNEY SMITH. Edited by his Daughter, Lady HOLLAND, and Mrs. AUSTIN. Crown 8vo. price 2s. 6d.

LEADERS of PUBLIC OPINION in IRELAND; Swift, Flood, Grattan, and O'Connell. By W. E. H. LECKY, M.A. New Edition, revised and enlarged. Crown 8vo. price 7s. 6d.

DICTIONARY of GENERAL BIOGRAPHY; containing Concise Memoirs and Notices of the most Eminent Persons of all Countries, from the Earliest Ages to the Present Time. Edited by W. L. R. CATES. 8vo. 21s.

LIFE of the DUKE of WELLINGTON. By the Rev. G. R. GLEIG, M.A. Popular Edition, carefully revised; with copious Additions. Crown 8vo. with Portrait, 6s.

FELIX MENDELSSOHN'S LETTERS from *Italy and Switzerland*, and *Letters from 1833 to 1847*, translated by Lady WALLACE. New Edition, with Portrait. 2 vols. crown 8vo. 6s. each.

MEMOIRS of SIR HENRY HAVELOCK, K.C.B. By JOHN CLARK MARSHMAN. Cabinet Edition, with Portrait. Crown 8vo. price 3s. 6d.

VICISSITUDES of FAMILIES. By Sir J. BERNARD BURKE, C.B. Ulster King of Arms. New Edition, remodelled and enlarged. 2 vols. crown 8vo. 21s.

The RISE of GREAT FAMILIES, other Essays and Stories. By Sir J. BERNARD BURKE, C.B. Ulster King of Arms. Crown 8vo. price 12s. 6d.

ESSAYS in ECCLESIASTICAL BIOGRAPHY. By the Right Hon. Sir J. STEPHEN, LL.D. Cabinet Edition. Crown 8vo. 7s. 6d.

MAUNDER'S BIOGRAPHICAL TREASURY. Latest Edition, reconstructed, thoroughly revised, and in great part rewritten; with 1,000 additional Memoirs and Notices, by W. L. R. CATES. Fcp. 8vo. 6s. cloth; 10s. calf.

LETTERS and LIFE of FRANCIS BACON, including all his Occasional Works. Collected and edited, with a Commentary, by J. SPEDDING, Trin. Coll. Cantab. Complete in 7 vols. 8vo. £4. 4s.

Criticism, Philosophy, Polity, &c.

A SYSTEMATIC VIEW of the SCIENCE of JURISPRUDENCE. By SHELDON AMOS, M.A. Professor of Jurisprudence to the Inns of Court, London. 8vo. price 18s.

A PRIMER of the ENGLISH CONSTITUTION and GOVERNMENT. By SHELDON AMOS, M.A. Professor of Jurisprudence to the Inns of Court. New Edition, revised. Post 8vo. [*In the press.*]

THE INSTITUTES OF JUSTINIAN; with English Introduction, Translation and Notes. By T. C. SANDARS, M.A. Sixth Edition. 8vo. 18s.

SOCRATES and the SOCRATIC SCHOOLS. Translated from the German of Dr. E. ZELLER, with the Author's approval, by the Rev. OSWALD J. REICHEL, M.A. Crown 8vo. 8s. 6d.

THE STOICS, EPICUREANS, and SCEPTICS. Translated from the German of Dr. E. ZELLER, with the Author's approval, by OSWALD J. REICHEL, M.A. Crown 8vo. price 14s.

THE ETHICS OF ARISTOTLE, illustrated with Essays and Notes, By Sir A. GRANT, Bart. M.A. LL.D. Third Edition, revised and partly rewritten. [In the press.]

THE POLITICS OF ARISTOTLE; Greek Text, with English Notes. By RICHARD CONGREVE, M.A. New Edition, revised. 8vo. 18s.

THE NICOMACHEAN ETHICS OF ARISTOTLE newly translated into English. By R. WILLIAMS, B.A. Fellow and late Lecturer of Merton College, and sometime Student of Christ Church, Oxford. 8vo. 12s.

ELEMENTS OF LOGIC. By R. WHATELY, D.D. late Archbishop of Dublin. New Edition. 8vo. 10s. 6d. crown 8vo. 4s. 6d.

Elements of Rhetoric. By the same Author. New Edition. 8vo. 10s. 6d. crown 8vo. 4s. 6d.

English Synonymes. By E. JANE WHATELY. Edited by Archbishop WHATELY. Fifth Edition. Fcp. 8vo. price 8s.

DEMOCRACY in AMERICA. By ALEXIS DE TOCQUEVILLE. Translated by HENRY REEVE, C.B., D.C.L., Corresponding Member of the Institute of France. New Edition, in two vols. post 8vo. [In the press.]

POLITICAL PROBLEMS. Reprinted chiefly from the *Fortnightly Review*, revised, and with New Essays. By FRÉDÉRIC HARRISON, of Lincoln's Inn. 1 vol. 8vo. [In the press.]

THE SYSTEM OF POSITIVE POLITY, or TREATISE upon SOCIOLOGY, of AUGUSTE COMTE, Author of the System of Positive Philosophy. Translated from the Paris Edition of 1851-1854, and furnished with Analytical Tables of Contents. In Four Volumes, 8vo. to be published separately:—

VOL. I. The General View of Positive Polity and its Philosophical Basis. Translated by J. H. BRIDGES, M.B.

VOL. II. The Social Statics, or the Abstract Laws of Human Order. Translated by F. HARRISON, M.A.

VOL. III. The Social Dynamics, or the General Laws of Human Progress (the Philosophy of History). Translated by E. S. BEESLY, M.A.

VOL. IV. The Synthesis of the Future of Mankind. Translated by R. CONGREVE, M.A.

BACON'S ESSAYS with ANNOTATIONS. By R. WHATELY, D.D. late Archbishop of Dublin. New Edition, 8vo. price 10s. 6d.

LORD BACON'S WORKS, collected and edited by J. SPEDDING, M.A. R. L. ELLIS, M.A. and D. D. HEATH. 7 vols. 8vo. price 28. 18s. 6d.

ESSAYS CRITICAL and NARRATIVE. By WILLIAM FORSYTH, Q.C. LL.D. M.P. for Marylebone; Author of 'The Life of Cicero,' &c. 8vo. 16s.

- The SUBJECTION of WOMEN.** By JOHN STUART MILL. New Edition. Post 8vo. 5s.
- On REPRESENTATIVE GOVERNMENT.** By JOHN STUART MILL. Crown 8vo. price 2s.
- On LIBERTY.** By JOHN STUART MILL. New Edition. Post 8vo. 7s. 6d. Crown 8vo. price 1s. 4d.
- PRINCIPLES of POLITICAL ECONOMY.** By the same Author. Seventh Edition. 2 vols. 8vo. 30s. Or in 1 vol. crown 8vo. price 5s.
- ESSAYS on SOME UNSETTLED QUESTIONS of POLITICAL ECONOMY.** By JOHN STUART MILL. Second Edition. 8vo. 6s. 6d.
- UTILITARIANISM.** By JOHN STUART MILL. New Edition. 8vo. 5s.
- DISSERTATIONS and DISCUSSIONS, POLITICAL, PHILOSOPHICAL, and HISTORICAL.** By JOHN STUART MILL. 3 vols. 8vo. 36s.
- EXAMINATION of Sir. W. HAMILTON'S PHILOSOPHY, and of the Principal Philosophical Questions discussed in his Writings.** By JOHN STUART MILL. Fourth Edition. 8vo. 16s.
- An OUTLINE of the NECESSARY LAWS of THOUGHT; a Treatise on Pure and Applied Logic.** By the Most Rev. W. THOMSON, Lord Archbishop of York, D.D. F.R.S. Ninth Thousand. Crown 8vo. price 5s. 6d.
- PRINCIPLES of ECONOMICAL PHILOSOPHY.** By HENRY DUNNING MACLEOD, M.A. Barrister-at-Law. Second Edition. In Two Volumes. VOL. I. 8vo. price 15s.
- A SYSTEM of LOGIC, RATIOCINATIVE and INDUCTIVE.** By JOHN STUART MILL. Eighth Edition. Two vols. 8vo. 25s.
- The ELECTION of REPRESENTATIVES, Parliamentary and Municipal; a Treatise.** By THOMAS HARE, Barrister-at-Law. Crown 8vo. 7s.
- SPEECHES of the RIGHT HON. LORD MACAULAY,** corrected by Himself. People's Edition, crown 8vo. 3s. 6d.
- Lord Macaulay's Speeches on Parliamentary Reform in 1831 and 1832.** 16mo. 1s.
- FAMILIES of SPEECH: Four Lectures delivered before the Royal Institution of Great Britain.** By the Rev. F. W. FARRAR, D.D. F.R.S. New Edition. Crown 8vo. 3s. 6d.
- CHAPTERS on LANGUAGE.** By the Rev. F. W. FARRAR, D.D. F.R.S. New Edition. Crown 8vo. 5s.
- A DICTIONARY of the ENGLISH LANGUAGE.** By R. G. LATHAM, M.A. M.D. F.R.S. Founded on the Dictionary of Dr. SAMUEL JOHNSON, as edited by the Rev. H. J. TODD, with numerous Emendations and Additions. In Four Volumes, fco. price £7.
- A PRACTICAL ENGLISH DICTIONARY,** on the Plan of White's English-Latin and Latin-English Dictionaries. By JOHN T. WHITE, D.D. Oxon. and T. C. DONKIN, M.A. Assistant-Master, King Edward's Grammar School, Birmingham. Post 8vo. [In the press.]
- THESAURUS of ENGLISH WORDS and PHRASES,** classified and arranged so as to facilitate the Expression of Ideas, and assist in Literary Composition. By P. M. ROGER, M.D. New Edition. Crown 8vo. 10s. 6d.

LECTURES on the SCIENCE of LANGUAGE. By F. MAX MÜLLER, M.A. &c. Seventh Edition. 2 vols. crown 8vo. 16s.

MANUAL of ENGLISH LITERATURE, Historical and Critical. By THOMAS ARNOLD, M.A. New Edition. Crown 8vo. 7s. 6d.

SOUTHEY'S DOCTOR, complete in One Volume. Edited by the Rev. J. W. WARTER, B.D. Square crown 8vo. 12s. 6d.

HISTORICAL and CRITICAL COMMENTARY on the OLD TESTAMENT; with a New Translation. By M. M. KALISCH, Ph.D. VOL. I. *Genesis*, 8vo. 18s. or adapted for the General Reader, 12s. VOL. II. *Exodus*, 16s. or adapted for the General Reader, 12s. VOL. III. *Leviticus*, PART I. 16s. or adapted for the General Reader, 8s. VOL. IV. *Leviticus*, PART II. 16s. or adapted for the General Reader, 8s.

A DICTIONARY of ROMAN and GREEK ANTIQUITIES, with about Two Thousand Engravings on Wood from Ancient Originals, illustrative of the Industrial Arts and Social Life of the Greeks and Romans. By A. RICH, B.A. Third Edition, revised and improved. Crown 8vo. price 7s. 6d.

A LATIN-ENGLISH DICTIONARY. By JOHN T. WHITE, D.D. Oxon. and J. E. RIDDLE, M.A. Oxon. Revised Edition. 2 vols. 4to. 42s.

WHITE'S COLLEGE LATIN-ENGLISH DICTIONARY (Intermediate Size), abridged for the use of University Students from the Parent Work (as above). Medium 8vo. 18s.

WHITE'S JUNIOR STUDENT'S COMPLETE LATIN-ENGLISH and ENGLISH-LATIN DICTIONARY. New Edition. Square 12mo. price 12s.

Separately { The **ENGLISH-LATIN DICTIONARY**, price 5s. 6d.
The **LATIN-ENGLISH DICTIONARY**, price 7s. 6d.

A LATIN-ENGLISH DICTIONARY, adapted for the Use of Middle-Class Schools. By JOHN T. WHITE, D.D. Oxon. Square fcp. 8vo. price 8s.

An ENGLISH-GREEK LEXICON, containing all the Greek Words used by Writers of good authority. By C. D. YONGE, B.A. New Edition. 4to. price 21s.

MR. YONGE'S NEW LEXICON, English and Greek, abridged from his larger work (as above). Revised Edition. Square 12mo. price 8s. 6d.

A GREEK-ENGLISH LEXICON. Compiled by H. G. LIDDELL, D.D. Dean of Christ Church, and R. SCOTT, D.D. Dean of Rochester. Sixth Edition. Crown 4to. price 86s.

A Lexicon, Greek and English, abridged from LIDDELL and SCOTT'S *Greek-English Lexicon*. Fourteenth Edition. Square 12mo. 7s. 6d.

A SANSKRIT-ENGLISH DICTIONARY, the Sanskrit words printed both in the original Devanagari and in Roman Letters. Compiled by T. BENFET, Prof. in the Univ. of Göttingen. 8vo. 52s. 6d.

A PRACTICAL DICTIONARY of the FRENCH and ENGLISH LANGUAGES. By L. CONTANNEAU. Revised Edition. Post 8vo. 10s. 6d.

Contanseau's Pocket Dictionary, French and English, abridged from the above by the Author. New Edition, revised. Square 18mo. 8s. 6d.

NEW PRACTICAL DICTIONARY of the GERMAN LANGUAGE; German-English and English-German. By the Rev. W. L. BLACKLEY, M.A. and Dr. CARL MARTIN FRIEDLÄNDER. Post 8vo. 7s. 6d.

THE MASTERY of LANGUAGES; or, the Art of Speaking Foreign Tongues Idiomatically. By THOMAS PRENDERGAST. 8vo. 6s.

Miscellaneous Works and Popular Metaphysics.

ESSAYS on FREETHINKING and PLAIN-SPEAKING. By LESLIE STEPHEN. Crown 8vo. 10s. 6d.

THE MISCELLANEOUS WORKS of THOMAS ARNOLD, D.D. Late Head Master of Rugby School and Regius Professor of Modern History in the University of Oxford, collected and republished. 8vo. 7s. 6d.

MISCELLANEOUS and POSTHUMOUS WORKS of the Late HENRY THOMAS BUCKLE. Edited, with a Biographical Notice, by HELEN TAYLOR. 3 vols. 8vo. price 52s. 6d.

MISCELLANEOUS WRITINGS of JOHN CONINGTON, M.A. late Corpus Professor of Latin in the University of Oxford. Edited by J. A. SIMONDS, M.A. With a Memoir by H. J. S. SMITH, M.A. 2 vols. 8vo. 28s.

ESSAYS, CRITICAL and BIOGRAPHICAL. Contributed to the *Edinburgh Review*. By HENRY ROGERS. New Edition, with Additions. 2 vols. crown 8vo. price 12s.

ESSAYS on some THEOLOGICAL CONTROVERSIES of the TIME. Contributed chiefly to the *Edinburgh Review*. By HENRY ROGERS. New Edition, with Additions. Crown 8vo. price 6s.

LANDSCAPES, CHURCHES, and MORALITIES. By A. K. H. B. Crown 8vo. price 3s. 6d.

Recreations of a Country Parson. By A. K. H. B. First and SECOND SERIES, crown 8vo. 3s. 6d. each.

The Common-place Philosopher in Town and Country. By A. K. H. B. Crown 8vo. price 3s. 6d.

Leisure Hours in Town; Essays Consolatory, Æsthetical, Moral, Social, and Domestic. By A. K. H. B. Crown 8vo. 8s. 6d.

The Autumn Holidays of a Country Parson; Essays contributed to *Fraser's Magazine*, &c. By A. K. H. B. Crown 8vo. 3s. 6d.

Seaside Musings on Sundays and Week-Days. By A. K. H. B. Crown 8vo. price 3s. 6d.

The Graver Thoughts of a Country Parson. By A. K. H. B. First and SECOND SERIES, crown 8vo. 3s. 6d. each.

Critical Essays of a Country Parson, selected from Essays contributed to *Fraser's Magazine*. By A. K. H. B. Crown 8vo. 3s. 6d.

Sunday Afternoons at the Parish Church of a Scottish University City. By A. K. H. B. Crown 8vo. 3s. 6d.

Lessons of Middle Age; with some Account of various Cities and Men. By A. K. H. B. Crown 8vo. 3s. 6d.

Counsel and Comfort spoken from a City Pulpit. By A. K. H. B. Crown 8vo. price 3s. 6d.

CHANGED ASPECTS OF UNCHANGED TRUTHS; Memorials of St. Andrews Sundays. By A. K. H. B. Crown 8vo. 3s. 6d.

Present-day Thoughts; Memorials of St. Andrews Sundays. By A. K. H. B. Crown 8vo. 3s. 6d.

SHORT STUDIES ON GREAT SUBJECTS. By JAMES ANTHONY FROUDE, M.A. late Fellow of Exeter Coll. Oxford. 2 vols. crown 8vo. price 12s.

LORD MACAULAY'S MISCELLANEOUS WRITINGS:—

LIBRARY EDITION. 2 vols. 8vo. Portrait, 21s.

PEOPLE'S EDITION. 1 vol. crown 8vo. 4s. 6d.

LORD MACAULAY'S MISCELLANEOUS WRITINGS AND SPEECHES.

STUDENT'S EDITION, in crown 8vo. price 6s.

The Rev. SYDNEY SMITH'S ESSAYS contributed to the *Edinburgh Review*. Authorised Edition, complete in 1 vol. Crown 8vo. price 2s. 6d.

The Rev. SYDNEY SMITH'S MISCELLANEOUS WORKS; including his Contributions to the *Edinburgh Review*. Crown 8vo. 6s.

The Wit and Wisdom of the Rev. Sydney Smith; a Selection of the most memorable Passages in his Writings and Conversation. 16mo. 3s. 6d.

The ECLIPSE OF FAITH; or, a Visit to a Religious Sceptic. By HENRY ROGERS. Latest Edition. Fcp. 8vo. price 5s.

Defence of the Eclipse of Faith, by its Author; a rejoinder to Dr. Newman's *Reply*. Latest Edition. Fcp. 8vo. price 3s. 6d.

CHIPS from a GERMAN WORKSHOP; Essays on the Science of Religion, and on Mythology, Traditions, and Customs. By F. MAX MÜLLER, M.A. &c. Second Edition. 8 vols. 8vo. £2.

ANALYSIS of the PHENOMENA of the HUMAN MIND. By JAMES MILL. A New Edition, with Notes, Illustrative and Critical, by ALEXANDER BAIN, ANDREW FINDLATER, and GEORGE GROTE. Edited, with additional Notes, by JOHN STUART MILL. 2 vols. 8vo. price 28s.

An INTRODUCTION to MENTAL PHILOSOPHY, on the Inductive Method. By J. D. MORELL, M.A. LL.D. 8vo. 12s.

ELEMENTS of PSYCHOLOGY, containing the Analysis of the Intellectual Powers. By J. D. MORELL, M.A. LL.D. Post 8vo. 7s. 6d.

The SECRET of HEGEL; being the Hegelian System in Origin, Principle, Form, and Matter. By J. H. STIRLING, LL.D. 2 vols. 8vo. 28s.

SIR WILLIAM HAMILTON; being the Philosophy of Perception: an Analysis. By J. H. STIRLING, LL.D. 8vo. 6s.

The SENSES and the INTELLECT. By ALEXANDER BAIN, M.D. Professor of Logic in the University of Aberdeen. Third Edition. 8vo. 15s.

MENTAL and MORAL SCIENCE: a Compendium of Psychology and Ethics. By the same Author. Third Edition. Crown 8vo. 10s. 6d. Or separately: PART I. *Mental Science*, 6s. 6d. PART II. *Moral Science*, 4s. 6d.

LOGIC, DEDUCTIVE and INDUCTIVE. By the same Author. In TWO PARTS, crown 8vo. 10s. 6d. Each Part may be had separately:—PART I. *Deduction*, 4s. PART II. *Induction*, 6s. 6d.

- The PHILOSOPHY of NECESSITY**; or, Natural Law as applicable to Mental, Moral, and Social Science. By CHARLES BRAY. 8vo. 9s.
- On **FORCE**, its **MENTAL** and **MORAL CORRELATES**. By the same Author. 8vo. 6s.
- A MANUAL of ANTHROPOLOGY**, or **SCIENCE of MAN**, based on Modern Research. By CHARLES BRAY. Crown 8vo. price 6s.
- A PHRENOLOGIST AMONGST the TODAS**, or the Study of a Primitive Tribe in South India; History, Character, Customs, Religion, Infanticide, Polyandry, Language. By W. E. MARSHALL, Lieutenant-Colonel B.S.O. With 26 Illustrations. 8vo. 21s.
- A TREATISE of HUMAN NATURE**, being an Attempt to Introduce the Experimental Method of Reasoning into Moral Subjects; followed by Dialogues concerning Natural Religion. By DAVID HUME. Edited, with Notes, &c. by T. H. GREEN, Fellow and Tutor, Ball. Coll. and T. H. GROSE, Fellow and Tutor, Queen's Coll. Oxford. 2 vols. 8vo. 28s.
- ESSAYS MORAL, POLITICAL, and LITERARY**. By DAVID HUME. By the same Editors. 2 vols. 8vo. price 28s.
- UEBERWEG'S SYSTEM of LOGIC and HISTORY of LOGICAL DOCTRINES**. Translated, with Notes and Appendices, by T. M. LINDSAY, M.A. F.R.S.E. 8vo. price 16s.
- A BUDGET of PARADOXES**. By AUGUSTUS DE MORGAN, F.R.A.S. and C.P.S. 8vo. 15s.

Astronomy, Meteorology, Popular Geography, &c.

- BRINKLEY'S ASTRONOMY**. Revised and partly re-written, with Additional Chapters, and an Appendix of Questions for Examination. By J. W. STUBBS, D.D. Fellow and Tutor of Trinity College, Dublin, and F. BRUNNOW, Ph.D. Astronomer Royal of Ireland. Crown 8vo. price 6s.
- OUTLINES of ASTRONOMY**. By Sir J. F. W. HERSCHEL, Bart. M.A. Latest Edition, with Plates and Diagrams. Square crown 8vo. 12s.
- ESSAYS on ASTRONOMY**, a Series of Papers on Planets and Meteors, the Sun and Sun-surrounding Space, Stars and Star-Clondlets; with a Dissertation on the approaching Transit of Venus. By RICHARD A. PROCTOR, B.A. With 10 Plates and 24 Woodcuts. 8vo. 12s.
- THE TRANSITS of VENUS**; a Popular Account of Past and Coming Transits, from the first observed by Horrocks A.D. 1639 to the Transit of A.D. 2112. By R. A. PROCTOR, B.A. Cantab. With 20 Plates and numerous Woodcuts. Crown 8vo. [*Nearly ready.*]
- THE UNIVERSE and the COMING TRANSITS**: Presenting Researches into and New Views respecting the Constitution of the Heavens; together with an Investigation of the Conditions of the Coming Transits of Venus. By R. A. PROCTOR, B.A. With 22 Charts and 22 Woodcuts. 8vo. 16s.
- The MOON**; her Motions, Aspect, Scenery, and Physical Condition. By R. A. PROCTOR, B.A. With Plates, Charts, Woodcuts, and Three Lunar Photographs. Crown 8vo. 15s.

THE SUN; RULER, LIGHT, FIRE, and LIFE of the PLANETARY SYSTEM. By R. A. PROCTOR, B.A. Second Edition, with 10 Plates (7 coloured) and 107 Figures on Wood. Crown 8vo. 14s.

OTHER WORLDS THAN OURS; the Plurality of Worlds Studied under the Light of Recent Scientific Researches. By R. A. PROCTOR, B.A. Third Edition, with 14 Illustrations. Crown 8vo. 10s. 6d.

THE ORBS AROUND US; a Series of Familiar Essays on the Moon and Planets, Meteors and Comets, the Sun and Coloured Pairs of Stars. By R. A. PROCTOR, B.A. Crown 8vo. price 7s. 6d.

SATURN and its SYSTEM. By R. A. PROCTOR, B.A. 8vo. with 14 Plates, 14s.

SCHÉLLEN'S SPECTRUM ANALYSIS, in its application to Terrestrial Substances and the Physical Constitution of the Heavenly Bodies. Translated by JANE and C. LASSELL; edited, with Notes, by W. HUGGINS, LL.D. F.R.S. With 13 Plates (6 coloured) and 228 Woodcuts. 8vo. price 28s.

A NEW STAR ATLAS, for the Library, the School, and the Observatory, in Twelve Circular Maps (with Two Index Plates). Intended as a Companion to 'Webb's Celestial Objects for Common Telescopes.' With a Letterpress Introduction on the Study of the Stars, illustrated by 9 Diagrams. By R. A. PROCTOR, B.A. Crown 8vo. 5s.

CELESTIAL OBJECTS for COMMON TELESCOPES. By the Rev. T. W. WEBB, M.A. F.R.A.S. Third Edition, revised and enlarged; with Maps, Plate, and Woodcuts. Crown 8vo. price 7s. 6d.

AIR and RAIN; the Beginnings of a Chemical Climatology. By ROBERT ANGUS SMITH, Ph.D. F.R.S. F.C.S. With 8 Illustrations. 8vo. 24s.

NAUTICAL SURVEYING, an INTRODUCTION to the PRACTICAL and THEORETICAL STUDY of. By J. K. LAUGHTON, M.A. Small 8vo. 6s.

MAGNETISM and DEVIATION of the COMPASS. For the Use of Students in Navigation and Science Schools. By J. MERRIFIELD, LL.D. 18mo. 1s. 6d.

DOVE'S LAW of STORMS, considered in connexion with the Ordinary Movements of the Atmosphere. Translated by R. H. SCOTT, M.A. 8vo. 10s. 6d.

KEITH JOHNSTON'S GENERAL DICTIONARY of GEOGRAPHY, Descriptive, Physical, Statistical, and Historical; forming a complete Gazetteer of the World. New Edition, revised and corrected to the Present Date by the Author's Son, KEITH JOHNSTON, F.R.G.S. 1 vol. 8vo. [Nearly ready.]

THE POST OFFICE GAZETTEER of the UNITED KINGDOM. Being a Complete Dictionary of all Cities, Towns, Villages, and of the Principal Gentlemen's Seats, in Great Britain and Ireland; Referred to the nearest Post Town, Railway and Telegraph Station: with Natural Features and Objects of Note. By J. A. SHARP. 1 vol. 8vo. of about 1,500 pages. [In the press.]

THE PUBLIC SCHOOLS ATLAS of MODERN GEOGRAPHY. In 31 Maps, exhibiting clearly the more important Physical Features of the Countries delineated, and Noting all the Chief Places of Historical, Commercial, or Social Interest. Edited, with an Introduction, by the Rev. G. BUTLER, M.A. Imp. 4to. price 8s. 6d. sewed, or 5s. cloth.

THE PUBLIC SCHOOLS MANUAL of MODERN GEOGRAPHY. By the Rev. GEORGE BUTLER, M.A. Principal of Liverpool College; Editor of 'The Public Schools Atlas of Modern Geography.' [In preparation.]

THE PUBLIC SCHOOLS ATLAS of ANCIENT GEOGRAPHY Edited, with an Introduction on the Study of Ancient Geography, by the Rev. GEORGE BUTLER, M.A. Principal of Liverpool College. Imperial Quarto. *[In preparation.]*

A MANUAL of GEOGRAPHY, Physical, Industrial, and Political. By W. HUGHES, F.R.G.S. With 6 Maps. Fcp. 7s. 6d.

MAUNDER'S TREASURY of GEOGRAPHY, Physical, Historical, Descriptive, and Political. Edited by W. HUGHES, F.R.G.S. Revised Edition, with 7 Maps and 16 Plates. Fcp. 6s. cloth, or 10s. bound in calf.

Natural History and Popular Science.

TEXT-BOOKS of SCIENCE, MECHANICAL and PHYSICAL, adapted for the use of Artisans and of Students in Public and Science Schools. Edited by T. M. GOODEVE, M.A. and C. W. MERRIFIELD, F.R.S.

ANDERSON'S Strength of Materials, small 8vo. 3s. 6d.

ARMSTRONG'S Organic Chemistry, 3s. 6d.

BLOXAM'S Metals, 3s. 6d.

GOODEVE'S Elements of Mechanism, 3s. 6d.

Principles of Mechanics, 3s. 6d.

GRIFFIN'S Algebra and Trigonometry, 3s. 6d. Notes, 3s. 6d.

JENKIN'S Electricity and Magnetism, 3s. 6d.

MAXWELL'S Theory of Heat, 3s. 6d.

MERRIFIELD'S Technical Arithmetic and Mensuration, 3s. 6d. Key, 3s. 6d.

MILLER'S Inorganic Chemistry, 3s. 6d.

SHELLEY'S Workshop Appliances, 3s. 6d.

THORPE'S Quantitative Chemical Analysis, 4s. 6d.

THORPE & MUIR'S Qualitative Analysis, 3s. 6d.

WATSON'S Plane and Solid Geometry, 3s. 6d.

. Other Text-Books in active preparation.

ELEMENTARY TREATISE on PHYSICS, Experimental and Applied.

Translated and edited from GANOT'S *Éléments de Physique* by E. ATKINSON, Ph.D. F.C.S. New Edition, revised and enlarged; with a Coloured Plate and 726 Woodcuts. Post 8vo. 16s.

NATURAL PHILOSOPHY for GENERAL READERS and YOUNG

PERSONS; being a Course of Physics divested of Mathematical Formulae expressed in the language of daily life. Translated from GANOT'S *Cours de Physique* and by E. ATKINSON, Ph.D. F.C.S. Crown 8vo. with 404 Woodcuts, price 7s. 6d.

HELMHOLTZ'S POPULAR LECTURES on SCIENTIFIC SUBJECTS.

Translated by E. ATKINSON, Ph.D. F.C.S. Professor of Experimental Science, Staff College. With an Introduction by Professor TYNDALL. 8vo. with numerous Woodcuts, price 12s. 6d.

SOUND: a Course of Eight Lectures delivered at the Royal Institution of Great Britain. By JOHN TYNDALL, LL.D. D.C.L. F.R.S. New Edition, with 169 Woodcuts. Crown 8vo. 9s.

HEAT a MODE of MOTION. By JOHN TYNDALL, LL.D. D.C.L. F.R.S. Fourth Edition. Crown 8vo. with Woodcuts, 10s. 6d.

CONTRIBUTIONS to MOLECULAR PHYSICS in the DOMAIN of RADIANT HEAT. By J. TYNDALL, LL.D. D.C.L. F.R.S. With 2 Plates and 81 Woodcuts. 8vo. 16s.

RESEARCHES on DIAMAGNETISM and MAGNE-CRYSTALLIC ACTION; including the Question of Diamagnetic Polarity. By J. TYNDALL, M.D. D.C.L. F.R.S. With 6 plates and many Woodcuts. 8vo. 14s.

NOTES of a COURSE of SEVEN LECTURES on ELECTRICAL PHENOMENA and THEORIES, delivered at the Royal Institution, A.D. 1870. By JOHN TYNDALL, LL.D., D.C.L., F.R.S. Crown 8vo. 1s. sewed; 1s. 6d. cloth.

A TREATISE on MAGNETISM, General and Terrestrial. By HUMPHREY LLOYD, D.D., D.C.L., Provost of Trinity College, Dublin. 8vo. price 10s. 6d.

ELEMENTARY TREATISE on the WAVE-THEORY of LIGHT. By HUMPHREY LLOYD, D.D. D.C.L. Provost of Trinity College, Dublin. Third Edition, revised and enlarged. 8vo. price 10s. 6d.

LECTURES on LIGHT delivered in the United States of America in the Years 1872 and 1873. By JOHN TYNDALL, LL.D. D.C.L. F.R.S. With Frontispiece and Diagrams. Crown 8vo. price 7s. 6d.

NOTES of a COURSE of NINE LECTURES on LIGHT delivered at the Royal Institution, A.D. 1869. By JOHN TYNDALL, LL.D. D.C.L. F.R.S. Crown 8vo. price 1s. sewed, or 1s. 6d. cloth.

ADDRESS delivered before the British Association assembled at Belfast; with Additions and a Preface. By JOHN TYNDALL, F.R.S. President. 8vo. price 3s.

FRAGMENTS of SCIENCE. By JOHN TYNDALL, LL.D. D.C.L. F.R.S. Third Edition. 8vo. price 14s.

LIGHT SCIENCE for LEISURE HOURS; a Series of Familiar Essays on Scientific Subjects, Natural Phenomena, &c. By R. A. PROCTOR, B.A. First and Second Series. Crown 8vo. 7s. 6d. each.

The CORRELATION of PHYSICAL FORCES. By the Hon. Sir W. R. GROVE, M.A. F.R.S. one of the Judges of the Court of Common Pleas. Sixth Edition, with other Contributions to Science. 8vo. price 15s.

Professor OWEN'S LECTURES on the COMPARATIVE ANATOMY and Physiology of the Invertebrate Animals. Second Edition, with 235 Woodcuts. 8vo. 21s.

The COMPARATIVE ANATOMY and PHYSIOLOGY of the VERTEBRATE ANIMALS. By RICHARD OWEN, F.R.S. D.C.L. With 1,472 Woodcuts. 8 vols. 8vo. £3. 18s. 6d.

PRINCIPLES of ANIMAL MECHANICS. By the Rev. S. HAUGHTON, F.R.S. Fellow of Trin. Coll. Dubl. M.D. Dubl. and D.C.L. Oxon. Second Edition, with 111 Figures on Wood. 8vo. 21s.

ROCKS CLASSIFIED and DESCRIBED. By BERNHARD VON COTTA. English Edition, by P. H. LAWRENCE; with English, German, and French Synonymes. Post 8vo. 14s.

THE ANCIENT STONE IMPLEMENTS, WEAPONS, and ORNAMENTS of GREAT BRITAIN. By JOHN EVANS, F.R.S. F.S.A. With 2 Plates and 476 Woodcuts. 8vo. price 28s.

- PRIMEVAL WORLD of SWITZERLAND.** By Professor OSWALD HERR, of the University of Zurich. Translated by W. S. DALLAS, F.L.S., and edited by JAMES HEYWOOD, M.A., F.R.S. 2 vols. 8vo. with numerous Illustrations. [In the press.]
- The ORIGIN of CIVILISATION and the PRIMITIVE CONDITION of MAN;** Mental and Social Condition of Savages. By Sir JOHN LUBBOCK, Bart. M.P. F.R.S. Third Edition, revised, with Woodcuts. [Nearly ready.]
- BIBLE ANIMALS;** being a Description of every Living Creature mentioned in the Scriptures, from the Ape to the Coral. By the Rev. J. G. WOOD, M.A. F.L.S. With about 100 Vignettes on Wood. 8vo. 21s.
- HOUSES WITHOUT HANDS;** a Description of the Habitations of Animals, classed according to their Principle of Construction. By the Rev. J. G. WOOD, M.A. F.L.S. With about 140 Vignettes on Wood. 8vo. 21s.
- INSECTS AT HOME;** a Popular Account of British Insects, their Structure, Habits, and Transformations. By the Rev. J. G. WOOD, M.A. F.L.S. With upwards of 700 Illustrations. 8vo. price 21s.
- INSECTS ABROAD;** a Popular Account of Foreign Insects, their Structure, Habits, and Transformations. By J. G. WOOD, M.A. F.L.S. Printed and illustrated uniformly with 'Insects at Home.' 8vo. price 21s.
- STRANGE DWELLINGS;** a description of the Habitations of Animals, abridged from 'Houses without Hands.' By the Rev. J. G. WOOD, M.A. F.L.S. With about 60 Woodcut Illustrations. Crown 8vo. price 7s. 6d.
- OUT of DOORS;** a Selection of original Articles on Practical Natural History. By the Rev. J. G. WOOD, M.A. F.L.S. With Eleven Illustrations from Original Designs engraved on Wood by G. Pearson. Crown 8vo. price 7s. 6d.
- A FAMILIAR HISTORY of BIRDS.** By E. STANLEY, D.D. F.R.S. late Lord Bishop of Norwich. Seventh Edition, with Woodcuts. Fcp. 8s. 6d.
- FROM JANUARY to DECEMBER;** a Book for Children. Second Edition. 8vo. 3s. 6d.
- The SEA and its LIVING WONDERS.** By Dr. GEORGE HARTWIG. Latest revised Edition. 8vo. with many Illustrations, 10s. 6d.
- The TROPICAL WORLD.** By Dr. GEORGE HARTWIG. With above 160 Illustrations. Latest revised Edition. 8vo. price 10s. 6d.
- The SUBTERRANEAN WORLD.** By Dr. GEORGE HARTWIG. With 3 Maps and about 80 Woodcuts, including 8 full size of page. 8vo. price 21s.
- THE AERIAL WORLD.** By Dr. GEORGE HARTWIG. With 8 Chromoxylographs and 60 Illustrations engraved on Wood. 8vo. price 21s.
- The POLAR WORLD,** a Popular Description of Man and Nature in the Arctic and Antarctic Regions of the Globe. By Dr. GEORGE HARTWIG. With 8 Chromoxylographs, 3 Maps, and 85 Woodcuts. 8vo. 10s. 6d.
- KIRBY and SPENCE'S INTRODUCTION to ENTOMOLOGY,** or Elements of the Natural History of Insects. 7th Edition. Crown 8vo. 5s.
- MAUNDER'S TREASURY of NATURAL HISTORY,** or Popular Dictionary of Birds, Beasts, Fishes, Reptiles, Insects, and Creeping Things. With above 900 Woodcuts. Fcp. 8vo. price 6s. cloth, or 10s. bound in calf.
- MAUNDER'S SCIENTIFIC and LITERARY TREASURY.** New Edition, thoroughly revised and in great part rewritten, with above 1,000 new Articles, by J. Y. JOHNSON. Fcp. 8vo. 6s. cloth, or 10s. calf.

HANDBOOK of HARDY TREES, SHRUBS, and HERBACEOUS PLANTS, containing Descriptions, Native Countries, &c. of a Selection of the Best Species in Cultivation; together with Cultural Details, Comparative Hardiness, Suitability for Particular Positions, &c. By W. B. HEMSLEY. Based on DECAISNE and NAUDIN's *Manuel de l'Amateur des Jardins*, and including the 264 Original Woodcuts. Medium 8vo. 21s.

A GENERAL SYSTEM of BOTANY DESCRIPTIVE and ANALYTICAL. I. Outlines of Organography, Anatomy, and Physiology; II. Descriptions and Illustrations of the Orders. By E. Lx MAOUT, and J. DECAISNE, Members of the Institute of France. Translated by Mrs. HOOKER. The Orders arranged after the Method followed in the Universities and Schools of Great Britain, its Colonies, America, and India; with an Appendix on the Natural Method, and other Additions, by J. D. HOOKER, F.R.S. &c. Director of the Royal Botanical Gardens, Kew. With 5,500 Woodcuts. Imperial 8vo. price 52s. 6d.

The TREASURY of BOTANY, or Popular Dictionary of the Vegetable Kingdom; including a Glossary of Botanical Terms. Edited by J. LINDLEY, F.R.S. and T. MOORE, F.L.S. assisted by eminent Contributors. With 274 Woodcuts and 20 Steel Plates. Two Parts, fcp. 8vo. 12s. cloth, or 20s. calf.

The ELEMENTS of BOTANY for FAMILIES and SCHOOLS. Tenth Edition, revised by THOMAS MOORE, F.L.S. Fcp. with 154 Woodcuts, 2s. 6d.

The ROSE AMATEUR'S GUIDE. By THOMAS RIVERS. Fourteenth Edition. Fcp. 8vo. 4s.

LOUDON'S ENCYCLOPEDIA of PLANTS; comprising the Specific Character, Description, Culture, History, &c. of all the Plants found in Great Britain. With upwards of 12,000 Woodcuts. 8vo. 42s.

A DICTIONARY of SCIENCE, LITERATURE, and ART. Fourth Edition, re-edited by W. T. BRADY (the original Author), and GEORGE W. COX, M.A., assisted by contributors of eminent Scientific and Literary Acquirements. 3 vols. medium 8vo. price 63s. cloth.

Chemistry and Physiology.

A DICTIONARY of CHEMISTRY and the Allied Branches of other Sciences. By HENRY WATTS, F.R.S. assisted by eminent Contributors. 6 vols. medium 8vo. price £8. 14s. 6d. SECOND SUPPLEMENT *in the Press*.

ELEMENTS of CHEMISTRY, Theoretical and Practical. By W. ALLEN MILLER, M.D. late Prof. of Chemistry, King's Coll. London. New Edition. 3 vols. 8vo. £3. PART I. CHEMICAL PHYSICS, 16s. PART II. INORGANIC CHEMISTRY, 21s. PART III. ORGANIC CHEMISTRY, 24s.

A Course of Practical Chemistry, for the use of Medical Students. By W. ODING, F.R.S. New Edition, with 70 Woodcuts. Crown 8vo. 7s. 6d.

A MANUAL of CHEMICAL PHYSIOLOGY, including its Points of Contact with Pathology. By J. L. W. THUDICHUM, M.D. With Woodcuts. 8vo. price 7s. 6d.

SELECT METHODS in CHEMICAL ANALYSIS, chiefly INORGANIC. By WILLIAM CROOKES, F.R.S. With 22 Woodcuts. Crown 8vo. price 12s. 6d.

A PRACTICAL HANDBOOK of DYEING and CALICO PRINTING.

By WILLIAM CROOKES, F.R.S. With 11 Page Plates, 49 Specimens of Dyed and Printed Fabrics, and 86 Woodcuts. 8vo. 42s.

OUTLINES of PHYSIOLOGY, Human and Comparative. By JOHN MARSHALL, F.R.C.S. Surgeon to the University College Hospital. 2 vols.

crown 8vo. with 122 Woodcuts, 82s.

PHYSIOLOGICAL ANATOMY and PHYSIOLOGY of MAN. By the late R. B. TODD, M.D. F.R.S. and W. BOWMAN, F.R.S. of King's College.

With numerous Illustrations. Vol. II. 8vo. 25s.

VOL. I. New Edition by Dr. LIONEL S. BEALE, F.R.S. in course of publication, with many Illustrations. PARTS I. and II. price 7s. 6d. each.

*The Fine Arts, and Illustrated Editions.***A DICTIONARY of ARTISTS of the ENGLISH SCHOOL: Painters,**

Sculptors, Architects, Engravers, and Ornamentists; with Notices of their Lives and Works. By S. REDGRAVE. 8vo. 16s.

The THREE CATHEDRALS DEDICATED to ST. PAUL, in LONDON;

their History from the Foundation of the First Building in the Sixth Century to the Proposals for the Adornment of the Present Cathedral. By WILLIAM LONGMAN, F.A.S. With numerous Illustrations. Square crown 8vo. 21s.

IN FAIRYLAND; Pictures from the Elf-World. By RICHARD DOYLE. With a Poem by W. ALLINGHAM. With Sixteen Plates, containing

Thirty-six Designs printed in Colours. Second Edition. Folio, price 15s.

ALBERT DURER, HIS LIFE and WORKS; including Auto-

biographical Papers and Complete Catalogues. By WILLIAM B. SCOTT. With Six Etchings by the Author, and other Illustrations. 8vo. 16s.

The NEW TESTAMENT, illustrated with Wood Engravings after the

Early Masters, chiefly of the Italian School. Crown 4to. 63s. cloth, gilt top; or 25 5s. elegantly bound in morocco.

LYRA GERMANICA; the Christian Year and the Christian Life.

Translated by CATHERINE WINKWORTH. With about 325 Woodcut Illustrations by J. LEIGHTON, F.S.A. and other Artists. 2 vols. 4to. price 42s.

The LIFE of MAN SYMBOLISED by the MONTHS of the YEAR.

Text selected by R. FIGOT; Illustrations on Wood from Original Designs J. LEIGHTON, F.S.A. 4to. 42s.

SACRED and LEGENDARY ART. By MRS. JAMESON.

Legends of the Saints and Martyrs. New Edition, with 19 Etchings and 187 Woodcuts. 2 vols. square crown 8vo. 31s. 6d.

Legends of the Monastic Orders. New Edition, with 11 Etchings and 88 Woodcuts. 1 vol. square crown 8vo. 21s.

Legends of the Madonna. New Edition, with 27 Etchings and 165 Woodcuts. 1 vol. square crown 8vo. 21s.

The History of Our Lord, with that of his Types and Precursors. Completed by Lady EASTLAKE. Revised Edition, with 31 Etchings and 281 Woodcuts. 2 vols. square crown 8vo. 42s.

DAEDALUS; or, the Causes and Principles of the Excellence of Greek Sculpture. By EDWARD FALKENER, Member of the Academy of Bologna, and of the Archaeological Institutes of Rome and Berlin. With Woodcuts, Photographs, and Chromolithographs. Royal 8vo. 42s. ;

FALKENER'S MUSEUM of CLASSICAL ANTIQUITIES; a Series of Essays on Ancient Art. New Edition, complete in One Volume, with many Illustrations. Royal 8vo. price 42s.

The Useful Arts, Manufactures, &c.

HISTORY of the GOTHIC REVIVAL; an Attempt to shew how far the taste for Mediæval Architecture was retained in England during the last two centuries, and has been re-developed in the present. By C. L. EASTLAKE, Architect. With 48 Illustrations. Imperial 8vo. 31s. 6d.

GWILT'S ENCYCLOPÆDIA of ARCHITECTURE, with above 1,600 Engravings on Wood. Fifth Edition, revised and enlarged by WYATT PAPWORTH. 8vo. 52s. 6d.

A MANUAL of ARCHITECTURE: being a Concise History and Explanation of the principal Styles of European Architecture. Ancient, Mediæval, and Renaissance; with a Glossary of Technical Terms. By THOMAS MITCHELL. Crown 8vo. with 150 Woodcuts, 10s. 6d.

HINTS on HOUSEHOLD TASTE in FURNITURE, UPHOLSTERY, and other Details. By CHARLES L. EASTLAKE, Architect. New Edition, with about 90 Illustrations. Square crown 8vo. 14s.

PRINCIPLES of MECHANISM, designed for the Use of Students in the Universities, and for Engineering Students generally. By R. WILLIS, M.A. F.R.S. &c. Jacksonian Professor in the University of Cambridge. Second Edition, enlarged; with 374 Woodcuts. 8vo. 18s.

GEOMETRIC TURNING: comprising a Description of Plant's New Geometric Chuck, with directions for its use, and a series of Patterns cut by it, with Explanations. By H. S. SAVORY. With numerous Woodcuts. 8vo. 21s.

LATHES and TURNING, Simple, Mechanical, and Ornamental. By W. HENRY NORTHCOOT. With about 240 Illustrations. 8vo. 18s.

PERSPECTIVE; or, the Art of Drawing what One Sees. Explained and adapted to the use of those Sketching from Nature. By Lieut. W. H. COLLINS, R.E. F.R.A.S. With 37 Woodcuts. Crown 8vo. price 5s.

INDUSTRIAL CHEMISTRY; a Manual for Manufacturers and for use in Colleges or Technical Schools. Being a Translation of Professors Stohmann and Engler's German Edition of PAYEN'S *Précis de Chimie Industrielle*, by Dr. J. D. BARRY. Edited and supplemented by B. H. PAUL, Ph.D. 8vo. with Plates and Woodcuts. [In the press.]

URE'S DICTIONARY of ARTS, MANUFACTURES, and MINES. Sixth Edition, rewritten and enlarged by ROBERT HUNT, F.R.S. assisted by numerous Contributors eminent in Science and the Arts, and familiar with Manufactures. With above 2,000 Woodcuts. 3 vols. medium 8vo. £4 14s. 6d.

- HANDBOOK of PRACTICAL TELEGRAPHY.** By R. S. CULLEY
Memb. Inst. C.E. Engineer-in-Chief of Telegraphs to the Post Office. Sixth
Edition, with 144 Woodcuts and 5 Plates. 8vo. price 16s.
- The ENGINEER'S HANDBOOK;** explaining the Principles which
should guide the Young Engineer in the Construction of Machinery, with the
necessary Rules, Proportions, and Tables. By C. S. LOWNDEN. Post 8vo. 6s.
- ENCYCLOPÆDIA of CIVIL ENGINEERING,** Historical, Theoretical,
and Practical. By E. CRESSY, C.E. With above 3,000 Woodcuts. 8vo. 42s.
- The STRAINS IN TRUSSES** computed by means of Diagrams; with
20 Examples drawn to Scale. By F. A. RANKEN, M.A. C.E. With 35 Dia-
grams. Square crown 8vo. 6s. 6d.
- TREATISE on MILLS and MILLWORK.** By Sir W. FAIRBAIRN,
Bart. F.R.S. New Edition, with 18 Plates and 322 Woodcuts. 2 vols. 8vo. 82s.
- USEFUL INFORMATION for ENGINEERS.** By Sir W. FAIRBAIRN,
Bart. F.R.S. Revised Edition, with Illustrations. 3 vols. crown 8vo. price 31s. 6d.
- The APPLICATION of CAST and WROUGHT IRON to Building**
Purposes. By Sir W. FAIRBAIRN, Bart. F.R.S. Fourth Edition, enlarged; with
6 Plates and 118 Woodcuts. 8vo. price 16s.
- GUNS and STEEL;** Miscellaneous Papers on Mechanical Subjects.
By Sir JOSEPH WHITWORTH, Bart. C.E. Royal 8vo. with Illustrations, 7s. 6d.
- A TREATISE on the STEAM ENGINE,** in its various Applications
to Mines, Mills, Steam Navigation, Railways, and Agriculture. By J. BOURNE,
C.E. Eighth Edition; with Portrait, 37 Plates, and 546 Woodcuts. 4to. 42s.
- CATECHISM of the STEAM ENGINE,** in its various Applications to
Mines, Mills, Steam Navigation, Railways, and Agriculture. By the same
Author. With 89 Woodcuts. Fcp. 8vo. 6s.
- HANDBOOK of the STEAM ENGINE.** By the same Author, forming
a KEY to the Catechism of the Steam Engine, with 67 Woodcuts. Fcp. 9s.
- BOURNE'S RECENT IMPROVEMENTS in the STEAM ENGINE** in its
various applications to Mines, Mills, Steam Navigation, Railways, and Agri-
culture. By JOHN BOURNE, C.E. New Edition, with 124 Woodcuts. Fcp. 8vo. 6s.
- HANDBOOK to the MINERALOGY of CORNWALL and DEVON;**
with Instructions for their Discrimination, and copious Tablets of Localities.
By J. H. COLLINS, F.G.S. With 10 Plates. 8vo. 6s.
- PRACTICAL TREATISE on METALLURGY,** adapted from the last
German Edition of Professor KRIEGER's *Metallurgy* by W. CROOKES, F.R.S. &c.
and E. BÖHRIG, Ph.D. M.E. With 625 Woodcuts. 3 vols. 8vo. price £4 18s.
- MITCHELL'S MANUAL of PRACTICAL ASSAYING.** Fourth Edi-
tion, for the most part rewritten, with all the recent Discoveries incorporated,
by W. CROOKES, F.R.S. With 199 Woodcuts. 8vo. 31s. 6d.
- LOUDON'S ENCYCLOPÆDIA of AGRICULTURE:** comprising the
Laying-out, Improvement, and Management of Landed Property, and the Cultiva-
tion and Economy of Agricultural Produce. With 1,100 Woodcuts. 8vo. 21s.
- Loudon's Encyclopædia of Gardening:** comprising the Theory and
Practice of Horticulture, Floriculture, Arboriculture, and Landscape Gardening.
With 1,000 Woodcuts. 8vo. 21s.

Religious and Moral Works.

SERMONS; Including Two Sermons on the Interpretation of Prophecy, and an Essay on the Right Interpretation and Understanding of the Scriptures. By the late Rev. THOMAS ARNOLD, D.D. 3 vols. 8vo. price 24s.

CHRISTIAN LIFE, its **COURSE**, its **HINDRANCES**, and its **HELPS**; Sermons preached mostly in the Chapel of Rugby School. By the late Rev. THOMAS ARNOLD, D.D. 8vo. 7s. 6d.

CHRISTIAN LIFE, its **HOPES**, its **FEARS**, and its **CLOSE**; Sermons preached mostly in the Chapel of Rugby School. By the late Rev. THOMAS ARNOLD, D.D. 8vo. 7s. 6d.

SERMONS chiefly on the **INTERPRETATION** of **SCRIPTURE**. By the late Rev. THOMAS ARNOLD, D.D. 8vo. price 7s. 6d.

SERMONS preached in the Chapel of Rugby School; with an Address before Confirmation. By the late Rev. THOMAS ARNOLD, D.D. Fcp. 8vo. price 3s. 6d.

THREE ESSAYS on **RELIGION**: Nature; the Utility of Religion; Theism. By JOHN STUART MILL. 8vo. price 10s. 6d.

INTRODUCTION to the **SCIENCE** of **RELIGION**. Four Lectures delivered at the Royal Institution; with Two Essays on False Analogies and the Philosophy of Mythology. By F. MAX MÜLLER, M.A. Crown 8vo. 10s. 6d.

SUPERNATURAL RELIGION; an Inquiry into the Reality of Divine Revelation. Third Edition, revised. 2 vols. 8vo. 24s.

ESSAYS on the **HISTORY** of the **CHRISTIAN RELIGION**. By JOHN EARL RUSSELL. Cabinet Edition, revised. Fcp. 8vo. price 3s. 6d.

The NEW BIBLE COMMENTARY, by Bishops and other Clergy of the Anglican Church, critically examined by the Right Rev. J. W. COLENSO, D.D. Bishop of Natal. 8vo. price 25s.

REASONS of **FAITH**; or, the **ORDER** of the Christian Argument Developed and Explained. By the Rev. G. S. DREW, M.A. Second Edition, revised and enlarged. Fcp. 8vo. price 6s.

SYNONYMS of the **OLD TESTAMENT**, their **BEARING** on **CHRISTIAN FAITH** and **PRACTICE**. By the Rev. R. B. GIRDLESTONE, M.A. 8vo. 16s.

An INTRODUCTION to the **THEOLOGY** of the **CHURCH** of **ENGLAND**, in an Exposition of the Thirty-nine Articles. By the Rev. T. P. BOULTER, LL.D. New Edition, Fcp. 8vo. price 6s.

SERMONS for the **TIMES** preached in St. Paul's Cathedral and elsewhere. By the Rev. THOMAS GRIFFITH, M.A. Crown 8vo. 6s.

An EXPOSITION of the **39 ARTICLES**, Historical and Doctrinal. By E. HAROLD BROWNE, D.D. Lord Bishop of Winchester. New Edit. 8vo. 16s.

The LIFE and **EPISTLES** of **ST. PAUL**. By the Rev. W. J. CONYBEARE, M.A., and the Very Rev. J. S. HOWSON, D.D. Dean of Chester:—**LIBRARY EDITION**, with all the Original Illustrations, Maps, Landscapes on Steel, Woodcuts, &c. 2 vols. 4to. 48s.

INTERMEDIATE EDITION, with a Selection of Maps, Plates, and Woodcuts. 2 vols. square crown 8vo. 21s.

STUDENT'S EDITION, revised and condensed, with 46 Illustrations and Maps. 1 vol. crown 8vo. price 9s.

THE VOYAGE and SHIPWRECK of ST. PAUL; with Dissertations on the Life and Writings of St. Luke and the Ships and Navigation of the Ancients. By JAMES SMITH, F.R.S. Third Edition. Crown 8vo. 10s. 6d.

COMMENTARY on the EPISTLE to the ROMANS. By the Rev. W. A. O'CONOR, B.A. Crown 8vo. price 8s. 6d.

THE EPISTLE to the HEBREWS; with Analytical Introduction and Notes. By the Rev. W. A. O'CONOR, B.A. Crown 8vo. price 4s. 6d.

A CRITICAL and GRAMMATICAL COMMENTARY on ST. PAUL'S Epistles. By C. J. ELLICOTT, D.D. Lord Bishop of Gloucester and Bristol. 8vo. Galatians, Fourth Edition, 8s. 6d.

Ephesians, Fourth Edition, 8s. 6d.

Pastoral Epistles, Fourth Edition, 10s. 6d.

Philippians, Colossians, and Philemon, Third Edition, 10s. 6d.

Thessalonians, Third Edition, 7s. 6d.

HISTORICAL LECTURES on the LIFE of OUR LORD. By C. J. ELLICOTT, D.D. Bishop of Gloucester and Bristol. Fifth Edition. 8vo. 12s.

EVIDENCE of the TRUTH of the CHRISTIAN RELIGION derived from the Literal Fulfilment of Prophecy. By ALEXANDER KEITH, D.D. 37th Edition, with Plates, in square 8vo. 12s. 6d.; 39th Edition, in post 8vo. 6s.

THE HISTORY and LITERATURE of the ISRAELITES, according to the Old Testament and the Apocrypha. By C. DE ROTHSCHILD and A. DE ROTHSCHILD. Second Edition, revised. 2 vols. post 8vo. with Two Maps, price 12s. 6d. Abridged Edition, in 1 vol. fcp. 8vo. price 3s. 6d.

AN INTRODUCTION to the STUDY of the NEW TESTAMENT, Critical, Exegetical, and Theological. By the Rev. S. DAVIDSON, D.D. LL.D. 2 vols. 8vo. 80s.

HISTORY of ISRAEL. By H. EWALD, Prof. of the Univ. of Göttingen. Translated by J. E. CARPENTER, M.A., with a Preface by RUSSELL MARTINEAU, M.A. 5 vols. 8vo. 63s.

THE TREASURY of BIBLE KNOWLEDGE; being a Dictionary of the Books, Persons, Places, Events, and other matters of which mention is made in Holy Scripture. By Rev. J. AYRE, M.A. With Maps, 16 Plates, and numerous Woodcuts. Fcp. 8vo. price 6s. cloth, or 10s. neatly bound in calf.

LECTURES on the PENTATEUCH and the MOABITE STONE. By the Right Rev. J. W. COLenso, D.D. Bishop of Natal. 8vo. 12s.

THE PENTATEUCH and BOOK of JOSHUA CRITICALLY EXAMINED. By the Right Rev. J. W. COLenso, D.D. Bishop of Natal. Crown 8vo. 6s.

THOUGHTS for the AGE. By ELIZABETH M. SEWELL, Author of 'Amy Herbert,' &c. New Edition, revised. Fcp. 8vo. price 3s. 6d.

PASSING THOUGHTS on RELIGION. By Miss SEWELL. Fcp. 8vo. 3s. 6d.

SELF-EXAMINATION before CONFIRMATION. By Miss SEWELL. 32mo. price 1s. 6d.

READINGS for a MONTH preparatory to CONFIRMATION, from Writers of the Early and English Church. By Miss SEWELL. Fcp. 4s.

- READINGS for EVERY DAY in LEWT**, compiled from the Writings of Bishop JEREMY TAYLOR. By Miss SEWELL. Fcp. 5s.
- PREPARATION for the HOLY COMMUNION**; the Devotions chiefly from the Works of JEREMY TAYLOR. By Miss SEWELL. 32mo. 3s.
- THOUGHTS for the HOLY WEEK for Young Persons**. By Miss SEWELL. New Edition. Fcp. 8vo. 2s.
- PRINCIPLES of EDUCATION** Drawn from Nature and Revelation, and applied to Female Education in the Upper Classes. By Miss SEWELL. 2 vols. fcp. 8vo. 12s. 6d.
- LYRA GERMANICA**, Hymns translated from the German by Miss C. WINKWORTH. FIRST and SECOND SERIES, price 3s. 6d. each.
- SPIRITUAL SONGS for the SUNDAYS and HOLIDAYS** throughout the Year. By J. S. B. MONSELL, LL.D. Fcp. 8vo. 4s. 6d.
- ENDEAVOURS after the CHRISTIAN LIFE**: Discourses. By the Rev. J. MARTINEAU, LL.D. Fifth Edition, carefully revised. Crown 8vo. 7s. 6d.
- HYMNS of PRAISE and PRAYER**, collected and edited by the Rev. J. MARTINEAU, LL.D. Crown 8vo. 4s. 6d.
- WHATELY'S INTRODUCTORY LESSONS on the CHRISTIAN** Evidences. 18mo. 6d.
- BISHOP JEREMY TAYLOR'S ENTIRE WORKS**. With Life by BISHOP HEBER. Revised and corrected by the Rev. C. P. EDEN. Complete in Ten Volumes, 8vo. cloth, price £5. 5s.

Travels, Voyages, &c.

- EIGHT YEARS in CEYLON**. By Sir SAMUEL W. BAKER, M.A. F.R.G.S. New Edition, with Illustrations engraved on Wood, by G. Pearson. Crown 8vo. 7s. 6d.
- The RIFLE and the HOUND in CEYLON**. By Sir SAMUEL W. BAKER, M.A. F.R.G.S. New Edition, with Illustrations engraved on Wood by G. Pearson. Crown 8vo. 7s. 6d.
- MEETING the SUN**; a Journey all round the World through Egypt, China, Japan, and California. By WILLIAM SIMPSON, F.R.G.S. With 48 Halotypes and Wood Engravings from Drawings by the Author. Medium 8vo. 24s.
- UNTRODDEN PEAKS and UNFREQUENTED VALLEYS**; a Midsummer Ramble among the Dolomites. By AMELIA B. EDWARDS. With a Map and 27 Wood Engravings. Medium 8vo. 21s.
- the DOLOMITE MOUNTAINS**; Excursions through Tyrol, Carinthia, Carniola, and Friuli, 1861-1863. By J. GILBERT and G. C. CHURCHILL, F.R.G.S. With numerous Illustrations. Square crown 8vo. 21s.
- The VALLEYS of TIROL**; their Traditions and Customs, and how to Visit them. By Miss R. H. BUSK, Author of 'The Folk-Lore of Rome,' &c. With Maps and Frontispiece. Crown 8vo. 12s. 6d.

HOURS of EXERCISE in the ALPS. By JOHN TYNDALL, LL.D. D.C.L. F.R.S. Third Edition, with 7 Woodcuts by E. Whymper. Crown 8vo. price 12s. 6d.

The ALPINE CLUB MAP of SWITZERLAND, with parts of the Neighbouring Countries, on the Scale of Four Miles to an Inch. Edited by R. C. NICHOLS, F.S.A. F.R.G.S. In Four Sheets, price 42s. or mounted in a case, 52s. 6d. Each Sheet may be had separately, price 12s. or mounted in a case, 16s.

MAP of the CHAIN of MONT BLANC, from an Actual Survey in 1863-1864. By ADAMS-REILLY, F.R.G.S. M.A.C. Published under the Authority of the Alpine Club. In Chromolithography on extra stout drawing-paper 28in. x 17in. price 10s. or mounted on canvas in a folding case, 12s. 6d.

TRAVELS in the CENTRAL CAUCASUS and BASHAN. Including Visits to Ararat and Tabreez and Ascents of Kazbek and Elbruz. By D. W. FRESHFIELD. Square crown 8vo. with Maps, &c. 18s.

PAU and the PYRENEES. By Count HENRY RUSSELL, Member of the Alpine Club, &c. With 2 Maps. Fcp. 8vo. price 5s.

HOW to SEE NORWAY. By Captain J. R. CAMPBELL. With Map and 5 Woodcuts. Fcp. 8vo. price 5s.

GUIDE to the PYRENEES, for the use of Mountaineers. By CHARLES PACKE. With Map and Illustrations. Crown 8vo. 7s. 6d.

The ALPINE GUIDE. By JOHN BALL, M.R.I.A. late President of the Alpine Club. 3 vols. post 8vo. Thoroughly Revised Editions, with Maps and Illustrations:—I. *Western Alps*, 6s. 6d. II. *Central Alps*, 7s. 6d. III. *Eastern Alps*, 10s. 6d.

Introduction on Alpine Travelling in General, and on the Geology of the Alps, price 1s. Each of the Three Volumes or Parts of the *Alpine Guide* may be had with this INTRODUCTION prefixed, price 1s. extra.

VISITS to REMARKABLE PLACES: Old Halls, Battle-Fields, and Stones Illustrative of Striking Passages in English History and Poetry. By WILLIAM HOWITT. 2 vols. square crown 8vo. with Woodcuts, 25s.

The RURAL LIFE of ENGLAND. By the same Author. With Woodcuts by Bewick and Williams. Medium 8vo. 12s. 6d.

Works of Fiction.

WHISPERS from FAIRYLAND. By the Rt. Hon. E. H. KNATCH-BULL-HUGGESSON, M.P. Author of 'Stories for my Children,' 'Moonshine,' 'Queer Folk,' &c. With Nine Illustrations from Original Designs engraved on Wood by G. Pearson. Crown 8vo. price 6s.

ELENA, an Italian Tale. By L. N. COMYN, Author of 'Atherstone Priory.' 2 vols. post 8vo. 14s.

CENTULLE, a Tale of Pau. By DENYS SHYNE LAWLOR, Author of 'Pilgrimages in the Pyrenees and Landes.' Post 8vo. 10s. 6d.

LADY WILLOUGHBY'S DIARY, 1635-1663; Charles the First, the Protectorate, and the Restoration. Reproduced in the Style of the Period to which the Diary relates. Crown 8vo. price 7s. 6d.

TALES of the TEUTONIC LANDS. By the Rev. G. W. Cox, M.A. and E. H. JONES. Crown 8vo. 10s. 6d.

The FOLK-LORE of ROME, collected by Word of Mouth from the People. By Miss B. H. BUSK, Author of 'Patrias,' &c. Crown 8vo. 12s. 6d.

NOVELS and TALES. By the Right Hon. B. DISRAELI, M.P. Cabinet Edition, complete in Ten Volumes, crown 8vo. price £3.

LOTHAIR, 6s.

CONINGSBY, 6s.

SYBIL, 6s.

TANCRED, 6s.

VENETIA, 6s.

HENRIETTA TEMPLE, 6s.

CONTARINI FLEMING, &c. 6s.

ALROY, IXION, &c. 6s.

The YOUNG DUKE, &c. 6s.

VIVIAN GREY, 6s.

The MODERN NOVELIST'S LIBRARY. Each Work, in crown 8vo. complete in a Single Volume :—

ATHERSTONE PRIORY, 2s. boards; 2s. 6d. cloth.

MELVILLE'S GLADIATORS, 2s. boards; 2s. 6d. cloth.

GOOD FOR NOTHING, 2s. boards; 2s. 6d. cloth.

HOLMBY HOUSE, 2s. boards; 2s. 6d. cloth.

INTERPRETER, 2s. boards; 2s. 6d. cloth.

KATE COVENTRY, 2s. boards; 2s. 6d. cloth.

QUEEN'S MARIES, 2s. boards; 2s. 6d. cloth.

DIGBY GRAND, 2s. boards; 2s. 6d. cloth.

GENERAL BOUNCE, 2s. boards; 2s. 6d. cloth.

TROLLOPE'S WARDEN, 1s. 6d. boards; 2s. cloth.

BARCHESTER TOWERS, 2s. boards; 2s. 6d. cloth.

BRAMLEY-MOORE'S SIX SISTERS of the VALLEYS, 2s. boards; 2s. 6d. cloth.

The BURGOMASTER'S FAMILY, 2s. boards; 2s. 6d. cloth.

CABINET EDITION of STORIES and TALES by Miss SEWELL :—

AMY HERBERT, 2s. 6d.

GERTRUDE, 2s. 6d.

The EARL'S DAUGHTER, 2s. 6d.

EXPERIENCE of LIFE, 2s. 6d.

OLIVE HALL, 2s. 6d.

IVORS, 2s. 6d.

KATHARINE ASHTON, 2s. 6d.

MARGARET PERCIVAL, 3s. 6d.

LANTON PARSONAGE, 3s. 6d.

URSULA, 3s. 6d.

CYLLENE; or, the Fall of Paganism. By HENRY SNEYD, M.A. University College, Oxford. 2 vols. post 8vo. price 14s.

BECKER'S GALLUS; or, Roman Scenes of the Time of Augustus : with Notes and Excursuses. New Edition. Post 8vo. 7s. 6d.

BECKER'S CHARICLES; a Tale illustrative of Private Life among the Ancient Greeks : with Notes and Excursuses. New Edition. Post 8vo. 7s. 6d.

TALES of ANCIENT GREECE. By GEORGE W. COX, M.A. late Scholar of Trin. Coll. Oxon. Crown 8vo. price 6s. 6d.

Poetry and The Drama.

FAUST; a Dramatic Poem. By GOETHE. Translated into English Prose, with Notes, by A. HAYWARD. Ninth Edition. Fcp. 8vo. price 3s.

MOORE'S IRISH MELODIES, MacLise's Edition, with 161 Steel Plates from Original Drawings. Super-royal 8vo. 31s. 6d.

Miniature Edition of Moore's Irish Melodies, with MacLise's Designs (as above) reduced in Lithography. Imp. 16mo. 10s. 6d.

- BALLADS and LYRICS of OLD FRANCE**; with other Poems. By A. LANG, Fellow of Merton College, Oxford. Square fcp. 8vo. price 5s.
- MOORE'S LALLA ROOKEH.** Tenniel's Edition, with 68 Wood Engravings from Original Drawings and other Illustrations. Fcp. 4to. 21s.
- SOUTHEY'S POETICAL WORKS**, with the Author's last Corrections and copyright Additions. Medium 8vo. with Portrait and Vignette, 14s.
- LAYS of ANCIENT ROME**; with **IVREY** and the **ARMADA**. By the Right Hon. Lord MACAULAY. 16mo. 3s. 6d.
- LORD MACAULAY'S LAYS of ANCIENT ROME.** With 90 Illustrations on Wood, from the Antique, from Drawings by G. SCHARF. Fcp. 4to. 21s.
- Miniature Edition of Lord Macaulay's Lays of Ancient Rome**, with the Illustrations (as above) reduced in Lithography. Imp. 16mo. 10s. 6d.
- The ÆNEID of VIRGIL** Translated into English Verse. By JOHN CONINGTON, M.A. New Edition. Crown 8vo. 9s.
- HORATII OPERA.** Library Edition, with Marginal References and English Notes. Edited by the Rev. J. E. YONGE. 8vo. 21s.
- The LYCIDAS and EPITAPHIUM DAMONIS of MILTON.** Edited, with Notes and Introduction (including a Reprint of the rare Latin Version of the Lycidas, by W. Hogg, 1694), by C. S. JERRAM, M.A. Crown 8vo. 3s. 6d.
- BOWDLER'S FAMILY SHAKESPEARE**, cheaper Genuine Editions. Medium 8vo. large type, with 36 Woodcuts, price 14s. Cabinet Edition, with the same ILLUSTRATIONS, 6 vols. fcp. 8vo. price 21s.
- POEMS.** By JEAN INGELOW. 2 vols. fcp. 8vo. price 10s.
FIRST SERIES, containing 'DIVIDED,' 'The STAR'S MONUMENT,' &c. Sixteenth Thousand. Fcp. 8vo. price 5s.
SECOND SERIES, 'A STORY of DOOM,' 'GLADYS and her ISLAND,' &c. Fifth Thousand. Fcp. 8vo. price 5s.
- POEMS** by Jean Ingelow. FIRST SERIES, with nearly 100 Illustrations, engraved on Wood by Dalziel Brothers. Fcp. 4to. 21s.

Rural Sports, &c.

- DOWN the ROAD**; Or, Reminiscences of a Gentleman Coachman. By C. T. S. BIRCH REYNARDSON. With Twelve Chromolithographic Illustrations from Original Paintings by H. ALKEN. Medium 8vo. [Nearly ready.]
- The DEAD SHOT**; or, Sportsman's Complete Guide: a Treatise on the Use of the Gun, Dog-breaking, Pigeon-shooting, &c. By MARKSMAN. Revised Edition. Fcp. 8vo. with Plates, 5s.
- ENCYCLOPEDIA of RURAL SPORTS**; a complete Account, Historical, Practical, and Descriptive, of Hunting, Shooting, Fishing, Racing, and all other Rural and Athletic Sports and Pastimes. By D. P. BLAINE. With above 600 Woodcuts (20 from Designs by JOHN LERCH). 8vo. 21s.

TALES of the TEUTONIC LANDS. By the Rev. G. W. Cox, M.A. and E. H. JONES. Crown 8vo. 10s. 6d.

The FOLK-LORE of ROME, collected by Word of Mouth from the People. By Miss R. H. BUSK, Author of 'Patrasias,' &c. Crown 8vo. 12s. 6d.

NOVELS and TALES. By the Right Hon. B. DISRAELI, M.P. Cabinet Edition, complete in Ten Volumes, crown 8vo. price £3.

LOTHAIR, 6s.
CONINGSBY, 6s.
SYBIL, 6s.
TANCRED, 6s.
VENETIA, 6s.

HENRIETTA TEMPLE, 6s.
CONTARINI FLEMING, &c. 6s.
ALROY, ILLION, &c. 6s.
The YOUNG DUKE, &c. 6s.
VIVIAN GREY, 6s.

The MODERN NOVELIST'S LIBRARY. Each Work, in crown 8vo. complete in a Single Volume :—

ATHERSTONE PRIORY, 2s. boards; 2s. 6d. cloth.

MELVILLE'S GLADIATORS, 2s. boards; 2s. 6d. cloth.

GOOD FOR NOTHING, 2s. boards; 2s. 6d. cloth.

HOLMBY HOUSE, 2s. boards; 2s. 6d. cloth.

INTERPRETER, 2s. boards; 2s. 6d. cloth.

KATE COVENTRY, 2s. boards; 2s. 6d. cloth.

QUEEN'S MARIES, 2s. boards; 2s. 6d. cloth.

DIGBY GRAND, 2s. boards; 2s. 6d. cloth.

GENERAL BOUNCE, 2s. boards; 2s. 6d. cloth.

TROLLOPE'S WARDEN, 1s. 6d. boards; 2s. cloth.

BARCHSTER TOWERS, 2s. boards; 2s. 6d. cloth.

BRAMLEY-MOORE'S SIX SISTERS of the VALLEYS, 2s. boards; 2s. 6d. cloth.

The BURGOMASTER'S FAMILY, 2s. boards; 2s. 6d. cloth.

CABINET EDITION of STORIES and TALES by Miss SEWELL :—

AMY HERBERT, 2s. 6d.

GERTRUDE, 2s. 6d.

The EARL'S DAUGHTER, 2s. 6d.

EXPERIENCE of LIFE, 2s. 6d.

OLIVE HALL, 2s. 6d.

IVORS, 2s. 6d.

KATHARINE ASHTON, 2s. 6d.

MARGARET PERCIVAL, 3s. 6d.

LANETON PARSONAGE, 3s. 6d.

URSULA, 3s. 6d.

CYLLENE; or, the Fall of Paganism. By HENRY SNEYD, M.A. University College, Oxford. 2 vols. post 8vo. price 14s.

BECKER'S GALLUS; or, Roman Scenes of the Time of Augustus : with Notes and Excursuses. New Edition. Post 8vo. 7s. 6d.

BECKER'S CHARICLES; a Tale illustrative of Private Life among the Ancient Greeks : with Notes and Excursuses. New Edition. Post 8vo. 7s. 6d.

TALES of ANCIENT GREECE. By GEORGE W. COX, M.A. late Scholar of Trin. Coll. Oxon. Crown 8vo. price 6s. 6d.

Poetry and The Drama.

FAUST: a Dramatic Poem. By GOETHE. Translated into English Prose, with Notes, by A. HAYWARD. Ninth Edition. Fcp. 8vo. price 3s.

MOORE'S IRISH MELODIES, MacLise's Edition, with 161 Steel Plates from Original Drawings. Super-royal 8vo. 31s. 6d.

Miniature Edition of Moore's Irish Melodies, with MacLise's Designs (as above) reduced in Lithography. Imp. 16mo. 10s. 6d.

BALLADS and LYRICS of OLD FRANCE; with other Poems. By A. LANG, Fellow of Merton College, Oxford. Square fcp. 8vo. price 5s.

MOORE'S LALLA ROOKEH. Tenniel's Edition, with 68 Wood Engravings from Original Drawings and other Illustrations. Fcp. 4to. 21s.

SOUTHEY'S POETICAL WORKS, with the Author's last Corrections and copyright Additions. Medium 8vo. with Portrait and Vignette, 14s.

LAYS of ANCIENT ROME; with IVRY and the ARMADA. By the Right Hon. Lord MACAULAY. 16mo. 3s. 6d.

LORD MACAULAY'S LAYS of ANCIENT ROME. With 90 Illustrations on Wood, from the Antique, from Drawings by G. SCHARF. Fcp. 4to. 21s.

Miniature Edition of Lord Macaulay's Lays of Ancient Rome, with the Illustrations (as above) reduced in Lithography. Imp. 16mo. 10s. 6d.

The ÆNEID of VIRGIL Translated into English Verse. By JOHN CONINGTON, M.A. New Edition. Crown 8vo. 9s.

HORATII OPERA. Library Edition, with Marginal References and English Notes. Edited by the Rev. J. E. YONGE. 8vo. 21s.

The LYCIDAS and EPITAPHIUM DAMONIS of MILTON. Edited, with Notes and Introduction (including a Reprint of the rare Latin Version of the Lycidas, by W. Hogg, 1694), by C. S. JERRAM, M.A. Crown 8vo. 3s. 6d.

BOWDLER'S FAMILY SHAKSPEARE, cheaper Genuine Editions. Medium 8vo. large type, with 36 WOODCUTS, price 14s. Cabinet Edition, with the same ILLUSTRATIONS, 6 vols. fcp. 8vo. price 21s.

POEMS. By JEAN INGELOW. 2 vols. fcp. 8vo. price 10s.

FIRST SERIES, containing 'DIVIDED,' 'The STAR'S MONUMENT,' &c. Sixteenth Thousand. Fcp. 8vo. price 5s.

SECOND SERIES, 'A STORY of DOOM,' 'GLADYS and her ISLAND,' &c. Fifth Thousand. Fcp. 8vo. price 5s.

POEMS by Jean Ingelow. FIRST SERIES, with nearly 100 Illustrations, engraved on Wood by Dalsiel Brothers. Fcp. 4to. 21s.

Rural Sports, &c.

DOWN the ROAD; Or, Reminiscences of a Gentleman Coachman. By C. T. S. BIRCH REYNARDSON. With Twelve Chromolithographic Illustrations from Original Paintings by H. Alken. Medium 8vo. [*Nearly ready.*]

The DEAD SHOT; or, Sportsman's Complete Guide: a Treatise on the Use of the Gun, Dog-breaking, Pigeon-shooting, &c. By MARKSMAN. Revised Edition. Fcp. 8vo. with Plates, 5s.

ENCYCLOPÆDIA of RURAL SPORTS; a complete Account, Historical, Practical, and Descriptive, of Hunting, Shooting, Fishing, Racing, and all other Rural and Athletic Sports and Pastimes. By D. P. BLAINE. With above 600 Woodcuts (20 from Designs by JOHN LEECH). 8vo. 21s.

- The STEPPING-STONE to ENGLISH HISTORY;** Questions and Answers on the History of England. 18mo. 1s.
- The STEPPING-STONE to BIBLE KNOWLEDGE;** Questions and Answers on the Old and New Testaments. 18mo. 1s.
- The STEPPING-STONE to BIOGRAPHY;** Questions and Answers on the Lives of Eminent Men and Women. 18mo. 1s.
- The STEPPING-STONE to IRISH HISTORY:** Containing several Hundred Questions and Answers on the History of Ireland. 18mo. 1s.
- The STEPPING-STONE to FRENCH HISTORY:** Containing several Hundred Questions and Answers on the History of France. 18mo. 1s.
- The STEPPING-STONE to ROMAN HISTORY:** Containing several Hundred Questions and Answers on the History of Rome. 18mo. 1s.
- The STEPPING-STONE to GRECIAN HISTORY:** Containing several Hundred Questions and Answers on the History of Greece. 18mo. 1s.
- The STEPPING-STONE to ENGLISH GRAMMAR:** Containing several Hundred Questions and Answers on English Grammar. 18mo. 1s.
- The STEPPING-STONE to FRENCH PRONUNCIATION and CONVERSATION:** Containing several Hundred Questions and Answers. 18mo. 1s.
- The STEPPING-STONE to ASTRONOMY:** Containing several Hundred familiar Questions and Answers on the Earth and the Solar and Stellar Systems. 18mo. 1s.
- The STEPPING-STONE to MUSIC:** Containing several Hundred Questions on the Science; also a short History of Music. 18mo. 1s.
- The STEPPING-STONE to NATURAL HISTORY: VERTEBRATE OR BACK-BONED ANIMALS.** PART I. *Mammalia*; PART II. *Birds, Reptiles, Fishes.* 18mo. 1s. each Part.
- THE STEPPING-STONE to ARCHITECTURE;** Questions and Answers explaining the Principles and Progress of Architecture from the Earliest Times. With 100 Woodcuts. 18mo. 1s.

INDEX.

ACTON's Modern Cookery	27	Cabinet Lawyer	26
AIRD's Blackstone Economised	27	CAMPBELL's Norway	23
Alpine Club Map of Switzerland	23	CATTE's Biographical Dictionary	6
Alpine Guide (The)	23	— and WOODWARD's Encyclopedia	2
AMOS's Jurisprudence	5	Changed Aspects of Unchanged Truths	10
— Primer of the Constitution	5	CHESNEY's Indian Polity	2
ANDERSON's Strength of Materials	13	— Modern Military Biography	2
ARMSTRONG's Organic Chemistry	13	— Waterloo Campaign	2
ARNOLD's (Dr.) Christian Life	30	CLOUGH's Lives from Plutarch	2
— Lectures on Modern History	2	COLENSO (Bishop) on Pentateuch	21
— Miscellaneous Works	9	— on Moabite Stone, &c.	21
— School Sermons	20	— on Speaker's Bible Commentary	20
— Sermons	20	COLLINS's Mineralogy of Cornwall	19
— (T.) Manual of English Literature	8	— Perspective	8
ARNOULD's Life of Denman	4	Commonplace Philosopher, by A.K.H.B. ...	9
Atherstone Priory	24	COMTE's Positive Philosophy	6
Autumn Holidays of a Country Parson	9	COMYN's Elena	23
ATRE's Treasury of Bible Knowledge	21	CONGREVE's Politics of Aristotle	6
		CONINGTON's Translation of the <i>Æneid</i> ...	25
		— Miscellaneous Writings	9
BACON's Essays, by WHATELY	6	CONTANSEAU's French-English Dictio-	
— Life and Letters, by SPEDDING	5	aries	8
— Works, edited by SPEDDING	6	CONYBARE and HOWSON's St. Paul	20
BAIN's Logic, Deductive and Inductive	10	COTTON's (Bishop) Memoir	4
— Mental and Moral Science	10	Counsel and Comfort from a City Pulpit	9
— on the Senses and Intellect	10	COX's Aryan Mythology	3
BAKER's 2 works on Ceylon	22	— Crusades	4
BALL's Alpine Guide	24	— History of Greece	2
BECKER's Charicles and Gallus	24	— Tale of the Great Persian War	3
BENFET's Sanskrit Dictionary	8	— Tales of Ancient Greece	24
BLACK's Treatise on Brewing	27	COX and JONES's Tales of Teutonic Lands	
BLACKLEY's German-English Dictionary	8	CRAWLEY's Thucydides	3
BLAINE's Rural Sports	25	CRALEY on British Constitutions	
BLOKAM's Metals	13	CREBY's Encyclopedia of Civil Engineer-	
BOULTREE on 39 Articles	10	ing	19
BOURNE's Catechism of the Steam Engine	19	Critical Essays of a Country Parson	9
— Handbook of Steam Engine	19	CROOKER's Chemical Analysis	16
— Improvements in the Steam		— Dyeing and Calico Printing	17
Engine	19	CULLEY's Handbook of Telegraphy	19
— Treatise on the Steam Engine	19	CUSACK's History of Ireland	3
BOWDLER's Family SHAKESPEARE	25		
BRAMLEY-MOORE's Six Sisters of the		DAVIDSON's Introduction to New Testament	
Valleys	25	Dead Shot (The), by MARKMAN	21
BRANDE's Dictionary of Science, Litera-		DECAIENRE and LE MACOUT's Botany	25
ture, and Art	16	DE MORGAN's Budget of Paradoxes	11
BRAY's Manual of Anthropology	11	DE TOCQUEVILLE's Democracy in America	6
— Philosophy of Necessity	11	DISRAELI's Lord George Bentinck	6
— on Force	11	— Novels and Tales	24
BRINKLEY's ASTRONOMY	11	DOBSON on the Ox	96
BROWNE's Exposition of the 39 Articles	20	DONKIN on Diabetes	17
BRUNEL's Life of BRUNEL	5	DOVE on Storms	12
BUCKLEY's History of Civilization	3	DOYLE's Fairyland	17
— Miscellaneous Writings	9	DREW's Reasons of Faith	20
BULL's Hints to Mothers	27		
— Maternal Management of Children		EASTLAKE's Hints on Household Taste	19
.....	27	— Gothic Revival	19
Burgomaster's Family (The)	25	EDWARDS's Travels in Tyrol	22
BURKE's Rise of Great Families	5	Elements of Botany	16
— Vicissitudes of Families	5		
BURK's Folk-Lore of Rome	24		
— Valleys of Tirol	23		

LONGMAN's Edward the Third	2	MOORE's Irish Melodies	24
Lectures on History of England	2	Lalla Rookh	25
Old and New St. Paul's	17	MORELL's Elements of Psychology	10
Chess Openings	27	Mental Philosophy	10
LOUDON's Agriculture	19	MORRIS's French Revolution	3
Gardening	19	MÜLLER's (MAX) Chips from a German	
Plants	16	Workshop	10
LOWNDES' Engineer's Handbook	19	Lectures on Language	8
LUBBOCK on Origin of Civilisation	15	Science of Religion	30
Lyra Germanica	17, 22		
MACAULAY's (Lord) Essays	3	New Testament, Illustrated Edition	17
History of England	1	NORTHCOOT's Lathes and Turning	18
Lays of Ancient Rome	25		
Miscellaneous Writings	10		
Speeches	7		
Complete Works	7	O'CONOR's Commentary on Hebrews	21
MACLEOD's Economical Philosophy	96	O'CONOR's Commentary on Romans	21
Theory and Practice of Banking	96	ODLING's Course of Practical Chemistry	16
MCCULLOCH's Dictionary of Commerce	3	OWEN's Lectures on the Invertebrata	14
MARKHAM's History of Persia	3	Comparative Anatomy and Physio-	
MARSHALL's Physiology	17	logy of Vertebrate Animals	14
Todas	11		
MARSHMAN's Life of Havelock	5	PACKER's Guide to the Pyrenees	23
MARTINEAU's History of India	2	PATTISON's Casaubon	4
MARTINEAU's Christian Life	23	PAYEN's Industrial Chemistry	18
Hymns	23	PEWTERER's Comprehensive Specifier	27
MAUNDER's Biographical Treasury	5	PIERCE's Chess Problems	27
Geographical Treasury	13	POLW on Whist	27
Historical Treasury	3	PRENDERGAST's Mastery of Languages	9
Scientific and Literary Treas-		Present-Day Thoughts, by A. K. H. B.	10
ury	15	PROCTOR's Astronomical Essays	11
Treasury of Knowledge	27	Moon	11
Treasury of Natural History	15	New Star Atlas	12
MAXWELL's Theory of Heat	13	Orbs Around Us	12
MAY's Constitutional History of England	1	Plurality of Worlds	12
History of Democracy	1	Saturn and its System	12
MELVILLE's Novels and Tales	24	Scientific Essays	14
MENDELSSOHN's Letters	5	Sun	12
MERIVALE's Fall of the Roman Republic	2	Transits of Venus	11
Romans under the Empire	2	Universe	11
MERRIFIELD's Arithmetic & Mensuration	13	Public Schools Atlases (The)	12
Magnetism	12	Modern Geography	12
MILES on Horse's Feet and Horseshoeing	96		
Horses' Teeth and Stables	96	RANKEN on Strains in Trusses	19
MILL (J.) on the Mind	10	RAWLINSON's Parthia	2
MILL (J. S.) on Liberty	7	Sassaniam Monarchy	2
on Representative Government	7	Recreations of a Country Parson	9
on Utilitarianism	7	REDGRAVE's Dictionary of Artists	17
's (J.S.) Autobiography	4	REILLY's Map of Mont Blanc	24
Dissertations and Discussions	7	REYNARDSON's Down the Road	25
Essays on Religion &c.	20	RIOH's Dictionary of Antiquities	8
Political Economy	7	RIVERS's Rose Amateur's Guide	16
System of Logic	7	ROGERS's Eclipse of Faith	10
Hamilton's Philosophy	7	Defence of ditto	10
Subjection of Women	7	Essays	9
Unsettled Questions	7		
MILLER's Elements of Chemistry	16		
Inorganic Chemistry	13		
MINTO's (Lord) Life and Letters	4		
MITCHELL's Manual of Architecture	18		
Manual of Assaying	19		
MONSELL's Spiritual Songs	22		

ROGET'S English Words and Phrases	7	THURDICHUM'S Chemical Physiology	16
RONALD'S Fly-Fisher's Entomology	26	TODD (A.) on Parliamentary Government	1
ROTHSCHILD'S Israelites	31	TODD and BOWMAN'S Anatomy and Physiology of Man	17
RUSSELL'S (Count) Pau and the Pyrenees	23	TREBOR'S Realities of Irish Life	3
RUSSELL (Lord) on Christian Religion	30	TROLLOPE'S Barchester Towers	25
_____ on Constitution & Government	2	_____ Warden	25
_____ 's Recollections and Suggestions	1	TYNDALL on Diamagnetism	14
		_____ Electricity	14
		_____ Heat	13
		_____ Sound	13
SANDARS'S Justinian Institutes	6	_____ American Lectures on Light	14
SANFORD'S English Kings	1	_____ Belfast Address	14
SAVORY'S Geometric Turning	18	_____ Fragments of Science	14
SCHERLEN'S Spectrum Analysis	13	_____ Hours of Exercise in the Alps	23
SCOTT'S Albert Durer	17	_____ Lectures on Light	14
Seaside Musings by A. K. H. B.	9	_____ Molecular Physics	14
SEEBORN'S Oxford Reformers of 1498	2		
_____ Protestant Revolution	4	USERWEG'S System of Logic	11
SEWELL'S Examination for Confirmation	21	URN'S Arts, Manufactures, and Mines	16
_____ History of the Early Church	3		
_____ Passing Thoughts on Religion	21	WARBURTON'S Edward the Third	4
_____ Preparations for Communion	23	WATSON'S Geometry	13
_____ Principles of Education	23	WATTS'S Dictionary of Chemistry	16
_____ Readings for Confirmation	21	WEBB'S Objects for Common Telescopes	12
_____ Readings for Lent	23	WELLINGTON'S Life, by GLIEG	5
_____ Tales and Stories	24	WHATELY'S English Synonyms	6
_____ Thoughts for the Age	21	_____ Life and Correspondence	4
_____ Thoughts for the Holy Week	23	_____ Christian Evidences	22
SHARP'S Post Office Gazetteer	12	_____ Logic	6
SHARPLEY'S Workshop Appliances	13	_____ Rhetoric	6
SHORR'S Church History	3	WHITE'S Latin-English and English-Latin Dictionaries	8
SIMPSON'S Meeting the Sun	22	WHITE & DONKIN'S English Dictionary	7
SMITH'S (J.) Paul's Voyage and Shipwreck	10	WHITWORTH on Guns and Steel	19
_____ (SYDNEY) Essays	10	WILCOCKS'S Sea Fisherman	26
_____ Life and Letters	5	WILLIAMS'S Aristotle's Ethics	6
_____ Miscellaneous Works	10	WILLIOT'S Popular Tables	26
SMITH'S (SYDNEY) Wit and Wisdom	10	WILLIS'S Principi of Mechanism	19
_____ (Dr. R. A.) Air and Rain	12	WILLOUGHBY'S (Lady) Diary	23
SNEYD'S Cyllene	24	WOOD'S Bible Animals	15
SOUTHEY'S Doctor	8	_____ Homes without Hands	15
_____ Poetical Works	25	_____ Insects at Home	15
STANLEY'S History of British Birds	15	_____ Abroad	15
STEPHEN'S Ecclesiastical Biography	5	_____ Out of Doors	15
_____ Freethinking & Plain Speaking	9	_____ Strange Dwellings	15
Stepping Stones (the Series)	27, 28		
STIRLING'S HAMILTON	10	YONGE'S English-Greek Lexicons	8
_____ HEGEL	10	_____ Horace	25
STONEHENGE on the Dog	26	YOUATT on the Dog	25
_____ on the Greyhound	26	_____ on the Horse	25
STRICKLAND'S Queens of England	5		
Sunday Afternoons, by A. K. H. B.	9	ZELLER'S Socrates	6
Supernatural Religion	30	_____ Stoics, Epicureans, and Sceptics	6
TAYLOR'S History of India	2		
_____ (Jeremy) Works, edited by EDEN	23		
Text-Books of Science	13		
THIRLWALL'S History of Greece	2		
THOMSON'S Laws of Thought	7		
THORPE'S Quantitative Chemical Analysis	13		
THORPE and MUIR'S Qualitative Analysis	13		

Spottiswoods & Co., Printers, New-street Square, London.

2. The second section focuses on the role of communication in achieving organizational goals. It highlights the importance of clear and concise communication, both internally and externally. The text provides guidelines for effective communication, such as using appropriate language, listening actively, and providing feedback. It also discusses the benefits of open communication, including improved collaboration and decision-making.

3. The third part of the document addresses the challenges of managing a large organization. It identifies key areas of concern, such as resource allocation, time management, and conflict resolution. The text offers practical advice on how to overcome these challenges, including prioritizing tasks, delegating responsibilities, and seeking support when needed. It also emphasizes the importance of maintaining a positive and productive work environment.

4. The final section discusses the importance of continuous learning and improvement. It encourages individuals and organizations to stay up-to-date with the latest trends and technologies in their field. The text provides suggestions for how to foster a culture of learning, such as offering training opportunities and encouraging innovation. It also mentions the importance of reflecting on past experiences and using them to inform future actions.





